Dr. Enoch Hale
Pam
Misc.
Southgate

LIBRARY

REPLY

OF THE

MISSIONARIES AT CONSTANTINOPLE,

TO THE CHARGES OF

REV. HORATIO SOUTHGATE.

LIBRARY
NEW YORK CITY

Mr. Southgate and the Missionaries at Constantinople.

A

LETTER

FROM THE

MISSIONARIES AT CONSTANTINOPLE,

IN

REPLY TO CHARGES

BY REV. HORATIO SOUTHGATE.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY CROCKER AND BREWSTER,
47, Washington-street.
1844.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
Columbia University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/mrsouthgatemissi00good

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

The occasion of this publication will be seen from the following statement. At the meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions at Rochester, N. Y., in September, 1843, allusion was made, in the Annual Report, to embarrassments at Constantinople, occasioned by the interference of "individuals, who had imbibed errors which now threaten the peace and unity of the Episcopal churches of England and America," with the labors and influence of the missionaries. In the discussions upon the Report, inquiries were made as to the nature of this interference, and the persons who were the authors of it. The reply of the Secretary to whom the inquiries were particularly addressed, was variously reported in the religious newspapers, and gave rise to the following correspondence.

Office of the Foreign Committee of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, Oct. 5, 1843.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—A copy of "the New York Evangelist" of the 21st September has been brought to me, which contains a report of the proceedings of the Thirty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Board,

held at the city of Rochester ; and my attention has been called to a passage in one of your own addresses, which involves very serious charges against our missionary to Constantinople. The passage reads thus ;—"The Rev. Horatio Southgate, missionary of the Episcopal Society in this country, has co-operated with Mr. Badger in all the opposition made to the missionary operations of the Board, and has, as far as his influence has gone, coincided with the Papal missionaries."

Allow me very respectfully and affectionately to inquire, whether this be a correct report, and if so, upon what grounds you have felt it to be your duty to bring so grave an accusation. You will of course see the great importance, as well to the cause of our missions, as to Mr. Southgate, that this should be examined, and I cannot doubt your readiness to impart all the information of which you are possessed in regard to it.

I do not now write officially, but with the view of ascertaining the correctness of the report, and the authority upon which the charges are made, before calling the attention of our Committee to the same.

I am, with very sincere respect and regard, yours,

PIERRE P. IRVING,

Secretary.

Missionary House, Boston, Oct. 7, 1843.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Your letter of the 5th was received yesterday. How far the newspaper report of my remarks at Rochester concerning Mr. Southgate is correct, you will perceive by what follows.

In my remarks concerning Mr. Badger, which were made in reply to a call for information with respect to his

proceedings, I intimated an opinion that, in the interference with our labors at Constantinople, he was not the principal agent.

Dr. T., of Maine, desired to know to what other adverse influence I referred.

To this, as nearly as I can recollect, I replied, that as no harm could come from the truth, I would frankly say, that I referred to the Rev. Mr. Southgate, a missionary from the Episcopal church of this country. Mr. Southgate had unhappily adopted such views of his duty, that he felt himself at liberty to co-operate with Mr. Badger while Mr. B. was at Constantinople, and had acted in opposition to our missionaries; and, as we had reason to believe, was the chief cause of the hostile movement which had constrained Mr. Dwight to suspend, for a season, his meeting for preaching, and had led Mr. Hohannes (then present) to come to this country.

I was called upon unexpectedly, and made my remarks as few and as brief as possible. Knowing the delicacy of the subject, I took some pains to remember what I said. Though I made repeated reference to Papal missionaries when speaking of Mr. Badger, I do not think I made any such reference when speaking of Mr. Southgate.

You will perceive, Dear Sir, that mere newspaper reports cannot make it proper for us, as a Missionary Society, to go into a formal inculpation to your Society of one of its missionaries, because, in the progress of our discussions, it was necessary for us to say somewhat to his disadvantage. We regretted the necessity as much as it is possible for any one to do, while we believed in its existence.

I could do no less, however, in reply to your fraternal inquiries, than tell you frankly what I believe myself to have said. I do it as an act of christian courtesy, and

shall always be happy to do what I can to avoid everything like controversy with you and your respected associates in the work of missions.

I am, Dear Sir, very respectfully and truly yours,

RUFUS ANDERSON,

Secretary.

With this corrected statement of Dr. Anderson's remarks before him, Mr. Southgate, who was then at Constantinople, addressed a letter, on the 4th of December, 1843, to the missionaries of the American Board in that city, which led to a correspondence to which there will be a reference in the latter part of this pamphlet. On the 9th of January, 1844, he addressed a "Letter to Members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." This letter was printed as a "Vindication of the Rev. Horatio Southgate," with two appended letters, and has been extensively circulated. These letters contain, besides the "Vindication," a series of charges against the American Board and its missionaries of the gravest character.

So far as the *American Board* is concerned, no answer has been given to these charges, except in the following declaration of Dr. Anderson at the Annual Meeting at Worcester, in September last. In reply to an inquiry publicly made by a member, Dr. A. said;—"I have read the pamphlet of Mr. Southgate since my return from the Mediterranean, and feel bound, by a regard for justice, to say, that, so far as it affects the *Missionaries* or the *Board* unfavorably, I believe it to be UNTRUE THROUGHOUT." In this denial of the charges the Rev. Dr. Hawes, who had spent more than a month with Dr. Anderson at Constantinople, fully concurred. Probably no other reply than this will be thought necessary.

To the greater part of the charges against *themselves*,

the missionaries have replied in a letter dated Constantinople, Sept. 4, 1844. It has been thought due to them to publish this communication, with extracts from letters previously received. It will be seen, that it was written only in reply to Mr. Southgate's "Letter to the Members of the Protestant Episcopal Church." The Appendix, in which Mr. Southgate gives his account of the causes leading to the suspension of Mr. Dwight's preaching service, they had not received, as only "the letter" was sent by the overland mail. The facts on this point had been previously communicated to the Board, in two letters,—one written immediately after the event occurred, and the other in connection with the correspondence between Mr. S. and themselves already alluded to. Both of these letters, as well as the Reply, had the sanction of all the missionaries residing at the station. Extracts from these letters are appended to their more recent communication. In compliance with the wishes of the missionaries, two or three extracts are added from other letters approved and sanctioned by the station.

For the facts asserted in these letters, the missionaries are responsible. For the selection and arrangement of them, the editor only is responsible, who is in no way officially connected with the Board.

Boston, Nov. 1, 1844.

REPLY

OF THE

MISSIONARIES AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

Constantinople, Sept. 4, 1844.

Dear Sir:—Your letter of July 15th addressed to our station, and the printed "Vindication" of Mr. Southgate enclosed in it, were duly received. We could not, however, have replied to you, as you requested, so that our answer would reach you before the meeting of the Board, even if it had been possible for us to forward our communication by the post next following the receipt of your letter. As it is, we have made the greatest despatch consistent with our other duties, and a careful examination of the subject before us.

In the remarks which follow on Mr. Southgate's pamphlet, we wish you to understand that we notice only those points in which *we* are properly concerned. We do not acknowledge the slightest responsibility in regard to the words and actions of others, whether they be correspondents or reporters of newspapers, missionaries of other stations, or any other class of persons; nor is it our province to explain the Reports of the Board, or any of your own declarations, referred to by Mr. Southgate. Nor shall we apply to ourselves any of those general charges, found in his "Vindication," of "vituperation" and "abuse" cast upon him, until he distinctly specifies *what* was done, and that *we* were the authors of it; in which case we shall give to those portions of his pamphlet a due share of notice. You will perceive that we refer, in this letter, only to the main body of the "Vindication," as only that, with the first page of the Appendix, has yet reached us.* We cannot, of

* Sent by mail, *overland*.—Ed.

course, now decide whether an additional communication on the appendix will be called for. We have one more prefatory remark, to which we beg leave to call your *particular attention*, and that is, that there are several points in the pamphlet before us upon which we should have dwelt much more at large, had we not already fully written to you on these same topics ; and we would here request that you will take the trouble to reperuse the documents already in your hands, that you may have the subject fully before you.

With these remarks we now proceed to a notice of Mr. Southgate's " Vindication."

1. He represents us as being hostile to Episcopal missions, as such. In proof of this, he urges, (p. 21), that we stated to Dr. Robertson and himself, in a formal conference, called by ourselves, our objection to the principle of bringing *their church* to light, before the oriental communions. We utterly deny having ever cherished or expressed any more objection to having the Episcopal church brought to light before the people, than to having the Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, or any other of the churches into which Protestant christians are divided. We have objected and we do object to all *sectarian* movements among the eastern christians, and we may have said at the interview alluded to with Dr. Robertson and Mr. Southgate, that in our view it is exceedingly undesirable to thrust before these eastern christians, —for whose conversion from a formal to a spiritual religion we are all professing to labor,—a view of the various questions of mere form and ceremony, and of church order and government, which divide Protestant christians ; and that if one body of christians were thus to bring forward the peculiarities of their own church, others would, as an inevitable consequence, feel obliged to bring forward theirs in self-defence. The conference was not called, however, for the purpose of discussing this subject, though that seems to be implied by Mr. Southgate's language ; but it was called chiefly for the purpose of asking an explanation of those passages in the Instructions to Dr. R. and Mr. S. referred to on page 19th of the " Vindication."

That the missionaries of the American Board have no hostility to Episcopal missionaries, as such, is sufficiently evident from the facts, that different individuals among us have often been very intimately associated with missionaries of the Church of England ; that we have never had the slightest difficulty with any such, so long as their great object has been to preach *Christ and him crucified*, and labor for the souls of men ; and that, in some instances, stated meetings for prayer and mutual consultation have been held with such, for years, without any interruption of harmony. Indeed we may appeal to our earliest intercourse with Mr. Southgate himself as evidence

on this point. He will bear us witness, that we lived with him on terms of the most friendly christian fellowship, and expressed to him our entire assurance that if *he* came to labor permanently at Constantinople, we should have no difficulty in acting, each in his proper sphere, in perfect harmony and christian love. This was the true desire and purpose of our hearts; and our confidence that we should thus live with Mr. Southgate, was based upon the fact that he had manifested, up to that time, no other than the most catholic spirit. He had sat down to the communion table with us, receiving the sacrament from our hands, and also taking part with us in the administration of it; he had attended public service regularly with us on the Sabbath, sometimes preaching for us, and sometimes listening to our preaching; and often had he bent the knee together with us before the throne of grace in prayer, he taking his turn, in a most edifying manner, though without book or stated form. In short, he seemed to make little or nothing of those differences which separate evangelical Christians, and to be determined to know nothing but *Jesus Christ and him crucified.* With persons of such a spirit we have never had the shadow of a controversy, nor would it ever have occurred to us to ask the question, whether such an individual was called Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or by some other name. True, when in a special conference, called by Mr. Southgate, before his first return to America, he formally and candidly asked our opinion as to the expediency of establishing an Episcopal mission to the Greeks in this city, we as candidly told him that, as *we* had already made a beginning, we felt that it would be better for the cause at large that the work should, if possible, be under one direction, and that we feared that, if other societies stepped in, the unity of plan and labor would be destroyed, and there would be danger of such a clashing of measures as would be prejudicial to the work. Of this we had, unhappily, an example before us at Athens, to which we referred him. At the same time, we gave Mr. Southgate distinctly to understand that we did not pretend to set up any claim to the sole right of laboring here, among the Greeks, (for the question related to them alone), on the ground of previous occupancy; but, as he had *asked* of us our opinion on the subject, we felt it to be our duty frankly to express it.

He then informed us that he had no doubt an Episcopal mission would be established here among the Greeks, and he proposed that we should relinquish the whole Greek field in Constantinople to them, and write to our Society, recommending that an arrangement be made between our Board and his, that *our* labors should be confined to the *Armenians*, and *theirs* to the *Greeks.* This we declined doing on the ground that it did not belong to us to interfere with such questions, which the Boards at home must decide

for themselves. Our objection to having the Episcopal Board open a mission here, arose not from any hostility to them *as Episcopalians*, for we should have expressed ourselves precisely in a similar manner, had the proposition come from the Presbyterian or Baptist Board.*

We have stated on what pleasant terms of christian intercourse we lived with Mr. S. during his first visit to this capital. He, however, returned here from America an entirely changed man. We were prepared to receive him with the utmost christian cordiality, and live with him on the same terms of the most perfect peace as before. But we found him entirely metamorphosed by his visit to America, and determined to act on the most exclusive high church principles. As a man, he professed to be ready to live with us on terms of civility; but as a Christian, and especially as a Christian minister, he seemed to wish to have no visible relations with us. He would not consent even to have a prayer-meeting in common, which we formally proposed, lest it should be supposed by others that he recognized us as true ministers of Christ, equally with himself. We are willing to leave it with candid men to decide who first changed his principles of action, and took the first steps in the course that leads to alienation and hostility. Of the subsequent steps of Mr. Southgate in this course, we shall have occasion hereafter to speak.

2. Mr. Southgate represents us as being afraid to discuss the subject of Episcopacy here on the ground; and he says that if we would "oppose them fairly in the field, instead of circulating calumnies at home, it would be all they could ask." We shall say nothing of the calumnies here spoken of, until we are informed specifically what they are; and as to our being *afraid* fairly to face the subject of Episcopacy and discuss it before these eastern people, we are not conscious of having ever yet been deterred by any such motive. We gather from what Mr. S. says on these topics, that he would be heartily glad to have us spend our time in disputing with him about church government, liturgies, etc., before these poor, eastern Christians, who are already crushed almost to death by the enormous weight of their forms and ceremonies, instead of preaching to them the pure Gospel of Christ; that thus he might have fuller freedom to oppose us and our labors here; and that he would also wish that we might never utter a word on the subject of his doings, in our communications to you, lest, in some way, his conduct should be reported to the evangelical portion of his own church, and the permanence of his mission here be thereby endangered. But we are determined, as far as in us lies, not to gratify him, in either of these particulars. We have

---

* See Note I.

uniformly endeavored to act upon the principle of avoiding as much as possible, in our intercourse with the people, discussions about forms and shadows, and have endeavored to lead them directly to the great and saving truths of the Gospel; and, by the grace of God helping us, this course we hope to continue to pursue. True, Mr. Southgate's course here has made our efforts more or less "anti-episcopal," in spite of ourselves. He has been busily employed in "representing *his* church," and in informing the people that we "*are opposed to bishops, confirmation, and liturgies,*" and a very natural consequence has been, that we have been called upon, an hundred times oftener than we otherwise should have been, to explain to persons inquiring the simple mode of our own church organizations, and the reasons upon which it is founded. This we ordinarily do in as few words as possible, and we hasten to more important matters. We confess that Mr. Southgate has succeeded so far as this in making our labors anti-episcopal, and this is precisely in accordance with a prediction of yours in reference to another mission, quoted in the "Vindication" on the ninth page; but we still conscientiously adhere to our rule of avoiding as much as possible all discussion on these subjects. As to the other part of Mr. Southgate's desire, we some time ago gave him formal notice, by letter, that whenever he should oppose or hinder us in any way, we should feel ourselves in duty bound to report him to our Committee, just as we report any other obstacle that is thrown in the way of our labors, from whatever quarter it comes, whether it has a Turkish, Jewish, or nominally christian origin. Nor do we expect to be prevented from this, by his unwillingness to be reported.

3. Mr. Southgate accuses us of making the most studied and laborious efforts to conceal the fact that we are not Episcopalians, and also of descending to the practice of various arts to make the impression on the people that we are actually Episcopalians. This charge, substantially, has before been publicly made by Mr. S., and we have already furnished you with a satisfactory refutation of it. It is based on the supposition that we see, as clearly as Mr. Southgate seems to do, the superior advantages of Episcopal missionaries for laboring among these eastern churches, over Presbyterians and Congregationalists; whereas we regard his views on this subject as altogether visionary. If Episcopal missionaries are consistent *Protestants,*—willing to come out before these people and preach the fundamental doctrines of the Reformation, such as *justification by faith alone without the deeds of the law,* and regeneration properly explained,—they will as surely and as speedily be spurned by these eastern churches as subverters of the true faith, and as dangerous heretics with whom "an intimate fellowship and connection is impracticable," as any of their Pres-

byterian or Congregational brethren. The fact is, the subject of the *form of ecclesiastical government* is one which has never been agitated in these eastern churches, and about which they feel no particular interest. True, they are Episcopalians; and, no doubt, were the question ever to come before them of changing their form of government, many would be found who would strenuously plead for the Episcopal system. But what we mean to assert is, that we have never seen among the eastern churches any disposition to agitate the question, or any such stress laid upon it as by some Episcopalians in England and America. There it is made, by a certain class, a *test question*, by which the true church of Christ is to be known, but it has never yet been magnified into a question of such importance in the East. In the Armenian church, we have indeed been asked many times by bishops and other high ecclesiastics, as to the form of government of our church; but never, in a single instance, has the motive appeared to be to ascertain whether we are entitled to be considered as belonging to the true church of Christ or not; but merely to satisfy a very natural curiosity about the institutions of a country so distant and so little known as America. And when we have explained to them our mode of ordination by presbyteries or councils, they have never questioned the validity of such ordination. So far is Episcopacy from being the test of a true church with them, that they are quite accustomed to the sight of churches with "bishops and confirmation and liturgies," which, notwithstanding, are regarded by them as in the greatest heresies. Thus the Greek church regards the Armenian, and thus the Armenian regards the Nestorian; although no man who believes in the apostolic succession, can deny it to either of these churches.

The fact is, that with them the tests of orthodoxy are something very different. Among themselves the great questions of fellowship or non-fellowship are, "Do you believe in the two natures of Christ? or only in one nature?" "Do you use *leavened* or *unleavened* bread in the sacrament?" "Do you make the sign of the cross with *two* fingers, or *three*, or *one*?" And, in reference to representatives or missionaries from churches in America,—besides the above, other questions of graver interest would be asked, were any "intimate fellowship and connection" proposed, such as, "Do you acknowledge the intercession of the saints?" "Do you worship the Virgin Mary?" "Do you hold to the worship of pictures and of the cross?" "Do you believe the doctrine of transubstantiation and praying for the dead?" These are the great points in the view of oriental Christians generally, before which the question of the form of church government dwindles away to a mere point, a thing of the least possible consequence. The moment an Episcopal missionary avows him-

self on these and similar points as not symbolizing with these eastern churches, that avowal stamps him as a *Protestant;* and his plea of having three orders of the clergy, of having a "liturgy" and "confirmation," or even of keeping all the feasts and fasts of the church, will not save him from their anathemas. It is evident, therefore, that all Mr. Southgate's boasted superiority over non-episcopal missionaries must go for nothing, unless he practises a most studied concealment of his sentiments on the above and similar points. We have already stated some facts to you in previous communications, to which we would again refer you, which afford us painful evidence that Mr. Southgate, instead of protesting against the errors of these churches, as he professes to have done, has suffered himself to plead for them, and even to practice them. He himself told a pious native friend of ours, that he sometimes goes to the Greek church, and there makes the sign of the cross, and performs the other ceremonies *just as the Greeks do.* And we have been informed more than once, by the individuals themselves to whom he gave the advice, that he has instructed the people to obey their bishops in every thing, even when commanded to *bow down before pictures, and pray through the intercession of the Virgin Mary and the saints.* An Episcopal missionary, whose conscience will permit him to pursue this course, may, indeed, acquire a greater influence over the bishops and other ecclesiastics of these churches than a Presbyterian, and Congregational missionary can expect to do, who protests against all these corruptions; but it will obviously be an influence for evil, and not for good, and it can never be urged as an evidence of the superior advantages of episcopal over non-episcopal missionaries in laboring for the *reform* of these eastern communions. Our views on this question have always been, substantially, as above expressed, and of course we could never have had a motive to adopt that course of studied concealment which Mr. S. charges upon us. True, we have ever avoided introducing questions of mere form; yet we have, from the very beginning of our intercourse with eastern Christians, always most cheerfully explained the manner in which our churches are organized, whenever we have been inquired of on the subject, and this has happened probably some hundreds of times.

We recollect distinctly, that on one occasion, when a conference was held between Dr. Robertson and Mr. Southgate and ourselves, the former expressed himself as entirely incredulous in regard to an assertion of ours, that we do not labor to propagate our opinions on the mode of church government among this people, and Mr. Southgate seemed fully to sympathize with him in his doubts on this point. But now Mr. S. comes out before the public in America, and declares that we have *always* studiously

endeavored to conceal the fact that we are not Episcopalians! Does he really believe his own statements on this subject, or has this story been invented merely to help him out in his "Vindication?"

But we have still greater difficulty in explaining satisfactorily some subsequent representations of Mr. S., without impeaching his honesty of purpose and his regard to justice and to truth. On the twenty-fourth page of his "Vindication," he remarks that "it is a misfortune for Congregationalists to be here." It may be a misfortune to him and his sectarian plans that we are here; but we believe it to be a rich blessing to the people, and we can never cease to praise God for having brought us here in his good providence, and for having blessed, in so distinguished a manner, labors so unworthy. He then proceeds to say that he believes "all of us would heartily concur in the sentiment once expressed to him by one of our most useful missionaries, namely, '*I have often wished that I were an Episcopalian. I could labor to much greater advantage, if I were one.*'" Who this missionary was he does not inform us, and of course we cannot, as we would like to do, by inquiring of the individual ascertain whether or not Mr. Southgate had not misunderstood his meaning. But Mr. S. declares that he believes "*all of us* would *heartily concur* in this sentiment." We ought not, perhaps, to hold Mr. S. as strictly responsible for all that his words imply in this case. He was writing under a degree of excitement, in which he might very naturally be betrayed into the use of expressions not strictly accordant with soberness and truth. But we would like to appeal to him now, in his cool moments, and ask him if he really believes his own assertion? We cannot think that he does. He knows us too well to be so deceived in regard to our true sentiments. And besides, he must, when soberly reflecting on the subject, perceive that if we all were "*heartily*" wishing "*that we were Episcopalians,*" and if we conscientiously believed that "*we could labor to much greater advantage if we were,*" it certainly would happen that some of us at least, not to say all, would imitate his example, and leaving our own churches would speedily find our way into the Episcopal fold. We suppose that we should be as readily received as he was, and what should hinder us from going, if we are all "*heartily*" wishing it? And what prevented the individual to whom he alludes from becoming an Episcopalian, if that was the true desire of his heart?

In this connection we cannot resist the temptation to insert the testimony of one of the most distinguished of the English Episcopal missionaries ever sent to these countries. He once remarked to one of our number that he rejoiced, and acknowledged the good providence of God in it, that the missionaries from America to these dead churches, *were not Episcopal.* "You," said he, "are

as free as air. You stand upon the Bible alone ; but we are fettered by canons and rules, and have a great many other things to think of besides the Bible." It is, indeed, very sad when a missionary in these countries is obliged to represent "My *church* ;" when he feels bound, whatever else he may neglect, not to neglect "My *church*." Why ! the poor, perishing people of these countries have done nothing for ages, but extol, each in his own dialect, "My *church*." And is it not high time that somebody should come here, and, for once, turn away their thoughts from this everlasting figment of "My *church* ?" Is it not high time that they should at length begin to think whether Christ *himself* has not a *church* somewhere in the world, to which it would be a great privilege to belong ?

But we have not yet done with Mr. Southgate's vindication. There are still graver charges, under the head of concealment, which we are called upon to notice. He says (p. 24), that we have "so far concealed our real character, that in this city, where our mission has been established some thirteen years, the impression STILL PREVAILS GENERALLY, AMONG THE ARMENIANS, THAT THE CONGREGATIONAL MISSIONARIES ARE CLERGYMEN OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, AND I AM WELL ASSURED, THAT TILL WITHIN TWO OR THREE YEARS, THEY WERE ALL SUPPOSED TO BE BISHOPS. THE IMPRESSION HAS BEEN STRENGTHENED BY THEIR ADOPTING OUR CLERICAL DRESS, USING THE PRAYER-BOOK, MAKING THE SIGN OF THE CROSS IN BAPTISM, AND OTHER SUCH LIKE PRACTICES, UNKNOWN TO CONGREGATIONALISTS AT HOME."

Here is a most serious accusation, deeply affecting our character as Christians, and honest men ; which, if true, ought to banish us at once from the missionary field, and disgrace us forever. It amounts to nothing less than this, that, for a long course of years, we have studiously endeavored, by various deceptive arts, to make and strengthen the impression, that we are clergymen of the English church. And it is subsequently represented that the secret of all our dislike to the system of the Episcopal missionaries in this country is, that by their coming here, and representing their church, *our fraud* has been detected, and our true characters made known. It is evident that Mr. Southgate intended the sentence above quoted as the clinching argument of his book, and he has made it prominent by staring capitals, so as to make the greatest possible impression on the minds of his readers. And he well knew that those for whose special perusal he wrote these pages, could generally have no other means of understanding or explaining his representations, than what is furnished in his own book. He therefore wished them to believe that we *habitually* wear the episcopal clerical dress in performing religious services, and use the prayer-book, and make the sign of the cross in bap-

tism, and perform "other *such like practices*," *for the distinct purpose of making the impression* ON THE ARMENIANS *that we belong to the English church.* The whole force of his charge against us depends upon the two facts that we do these things *habitually*, and with special reference *to the Armenians.* If it could be shown that *ordinarily* we appear before the people, in conducting religious services, without any clerical dress, and that only now and then, usually at long intervals, we are seen with the black gown, this would make it sufficiently evident that our object was not to deceive the people, by the use of the episcopal robes, into a belief that we are Episcopalians, for then we should take good care never to appear without such robes, whenever it was *canonical* to wear them. And if it could be shown that, in our ordinary Sabbath services, no prayer-book is ever seen, but that, on certain other occasions, sometimes a few prayers have been read, by individuals among us, from that book, this would be satisfactory evidence that,—whatever else our motive might be,—in this occasional and partial use of the episcopal liturgy, it certainly was not to make the impression that we are ourselves Episcopalians. And especially, if it could be shown that *never, in any single instance*, in our ministrations to the Armenians, (upon whom especially, it is said, we wished to make this impression), have we used either the clerical robes, the prayer-book, the sign of the cross, or any other "*such like practices*" of Episcopacy, we think it must appear transparently evident to all, that the charge in question must have originated in some other desire than that of honestly stating "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." And this is precisely the state of the case. The adoption by us of the episcopal forms alluded to, has been only occasional and exceedingly rare, and *absolutely never* in any Armenian service; and we are sure that no reasonable man, when made acquainted with the facts, can possibly understand how Mr. Southgate could have framed such a charge against us, as he has, unless it was to build himself up in a false position, or for some other equally unworthy purpose. As to the use of the black gown, we would in the first place say, that we have heard for the first time, through Mr. Southgate's pamphlet, that it is the exclusive prerogative of episcopal clergymen to wear this dress, in performing religious services. We suppose Mr. Southgate knows, that your missionaries in Turkey, belong to four or five different denominations of Christians, although he pertinaciously calls us all Congregationalists; and he ought also to know, that, in at least one of these,* the black gown is as constantly and universally worn as it is in the episcopal church, and in each of the others it is occasionally worn, even to the very "Congregationalists." We confess,

---

* The *Lutheran.*—ED.

that, as a station, we do possess a black clerical dress, but it is a *Lutheran* gown; *and one of our episcopal brethren, who once wished to borrow it, refused to wear it, when he saw it, because of its uncanonical appearance! He decided at once, that it was wholly "Lutheran in its cut," and would not do for an Episcopalian.* This gown we never use except on funeral, sometimes on marriage, and more rarely on baptismal occasions. It has often been said by the people of this country, that the English and Americans have no religion; and as one evidence of this it is remarked, that when any one dies among them, he is buried like a dog, no clergyman being supposed to be present when no clerical dress is seen. This led us to adopt the general rule, that whenever we are called upon to attend the funeral of a *Frank*, whether American or of other nation, we will wear the clerical gown. In regard to other services, we are surrounded by people of many nations, many of whom are Protestants, such as English, Scotch, Germans, Danes, Swedes, &c., and as they are almost universally accustomed to see the gown worn by their clergymen, and sometimes have strong feelings on the subject, we ordinarily conform to their wishes in our ministrations among them. Who but a man in Mr. Southgate's peculiar state of mind, would ever think of charging us with attempting to pass ourselves off as Episcopalians, among the *Armenians*, in acting as we have done on this subject among the *Franks*?

In regard to baptism, we have sometimes been requested, in the absence of an episcopal clergyman, to administer the rite to the children of persons belonging to the English church, whose predilections were, very naturally, in favor of their own forms; and in consideration of their wishes, we have sometimes used the form of baptism prescribed in the prayer-book, every objectionable passage being conscientiously omitted, agreeably to the judgment of the one officiating; and if the sign of the cross has been made, according to this form, it has been rarely done, and out of regard to the preference of the parents. Multitudes of Armenians have been present when we have administered this ordinance, as we are accustomed to do, in our own simple way, without any prayer-book; and on one such occasion, as many as fifty were present; which is a sufficient refutation of the assertion of Mr. Southgate, that our object in using the prayer-book is to make the impression on this class of persons, that we are Episcopalians. We feel fully confident that not one Armenian in a hundred, and probably not one in a thousand, is aware that we ever use any of the episcopal forms of prayer on any occasion, while it is generally known that our *habit* is, to pray extemporaneously.* Our use of the prayer-

* It is now nearly thirteen years ago that a friend of ours had a conversation about *us*, with a distinguished bishop of the Armenian church who has since been Patriarch.

book, as will appear from what has been said, has been merely occasional, and always in a spirit of accommodation to the feelings of our English episcopal friends; and if Mr. Southgate himself had asked us to baptize one of his children, we should certainly, out of regard to his feelings, have used the episcopal form, with the same exceptions as above mentioned; though we should not have expected, that he would in consequence go home and report us as having used this form as a trick to deceive the Armenians into a belief that we are Episcopalians. On this point we would also add, that in this city of so much bigotry and superstition, where scarcely one can be found who would vary, in the least degree, from his own forms, to accommodate the feelings of others, we rejoice that we have had an opportunity of showing a different spirit. By conforming to *all* forms, so far as we innocently could, we have poured absolute contempt upon all *formal* religions. By being ready, in accommodation to the great weakness of men, to use, on special occasions, an Episcopal gown, a Lutheran one, a French one, or none at all; to use also occasionally an Episcopal liturgy, a French one, a Lutheran one, or none at all,—we have shown that we are immeasurably exalted above all the littleness of mere form and ceremony, and of that which is only external, and have exhibited a spirit of tolerance, which was not previously supposed here to have any existence on the earth. And this spirit of toleration we could have exhibited in no other way. For had we been as uncompromising and unaccommodating in regard to our simplicity of forms, as others are in regard to their exuberance, it would have been lowering ourselves down to the same level of exclusiveness and bigotry with all the rest. No difference whatever could have been seen between us and them. We should have been universally regarded as being as blindly and bigotedly attached to our own simplicity, as others are to their abundance; nor would it have been in our power to correct such an impression. But now, "*being free from all, we have made ourselves the servants of all, that we might gain the more.*" As to the perfectly simple and "congregational" form of our public services for the Armenians, Mr. Southgate bears the most explicit testimony, when he inadvertently admits, on the first page of his appendix, that these "services consist mainly in *extemporaneous* prayer and a sermon; or, in other words, they were *congregational services* in the Armenian language." How completely does this remarkable admission nullify

---

We were then little known here, and the bishop made many inquiries about our religious forms and customs. Among other things he asked how we perform our prayers. Our friend replied that we never use a book, but pray "directly from our hearts,"—meaning that we compose our own prayers as we go along. The bishop expressed some wonder that we were able to do this, but added, "*They do just as the Apostles did. They*, also, prayed in this manner."

all his previous assertions in regard to our studied attempts, by the adoption of episcopal forms, to pass ourselves off as Episcopalians upon the Armenians! What now becomes of his staring capitals, and indeed of the whole edge and point of his pamphlet? And what other theory will he now invent to account for what he calls our hostility to episcopal missions? What a notable illustration have we here, of the difficulty of harmonizing facts with false theories, and of framing a consistent story out of any thing but truth!

Mr. Southgate represents us as *adopting the episcopal clerical dress, using the prayer-book, making the sign of the cross in baptism, and other* SUCH LIKE PRACTICES, unknown to Congregationalists at home. To each of his specific charges we have given a specific answer, but what can he expect us to say in reference to a perfectly indefinite accusation, that we are guilty of "OTHER SUCH LIKE PRACTICES *unknown to Congregationalists at home?*" We have this to say, that if Mr. S. had any thing in his mind when he penned that expression, why did he not state it explicitly? If he had had any other thing upon which he could have seized, we do not doubt he would have mentioned it by name; and from the fact that he did not mention it, may it not be fairly concluded that he actually knew of no other "*such like practices*" to charge upon us? For what reason then did he insert this passage unless it was for the purpose of adding weight to the odium to be cast upon us? Reasonable men will not expect us to answer such wholesale charges, nor will they receive any additional impressions therefrom in favor of the justice, truth, and honesty of this "vindication" of his. We have a few remarks to make in regard to the assertion of Mr. Southgate, that "*the impression still prevails among the Armenians generally, that the Congregational missionaries are clergymen of the English church, notwithstanding our mission has been established here some thirteen years.*" It is evident that Mr. S. means that his readers shall understand either that *we* originated this impression, or that we have labored to perpetuate it, or both; and that the impression of which he speaks is definitely this,—that we are Episcopalians. We have already adduced facts sufficient to show that *we* could not be responsible for any such impression, even if it did exist, as Mr. S. represents. But that it does not exist, we think we can make plainly to appear. It is a fact, and upon this Mr. Southgate seems to have based his assertion, that among the great mass of the people in Turkey, English and American have been considered as one, and all have been called alike *Ingliz*, or English. And, among the *Christians* of this country, the appellation of *Ingliz* (English) has been indiscriminately applied to all *Protestants* of whatever nation, probably because the English

were the first Protestants with whom they became acquainted, and the most prominent. Thus the name became a generic one, and was used as a distinctive title of the Protestant faith. As a matter of course, when we arrived in this country we were called *Ingliz* by Greeks and Armenians; and to this day, many (though not *so* many as Mr. S. represents) still continue to apply to us this appellation, meaning by it that we are *Protestants* in our religion. In using this word, however, *they have no reference whatever to the form of church government among us*, and they no more mean to imply that we belong to the *episcopal* church when they apply the name to us, than they do that Mr. Southgate belongs to the *presbyterian* church, when they apply the name to him. There are some other appellations which, with these persons to whom Mr. Southgate alludes, are considered as perfectly synonymous with *Ingliz*, or English, viz. *Lutran* (Lutheran), Framason (Freemason), and *Volter* (a follower of Voltaire); and these terms are applied as well to Episcopalians, as to Congregationalists and Presbyterians. We may therefore say with truth, that just so far as the impression prevails that we are clergymen of the English church, just so far does the impression prevail that Mr. Southgate is a member of the Lutheran church, and this he cannot deny. And in either case, not a thought is expended by the people upon the question as to what form of church government we respectively adopt. Mr. Southgate has therefore seized hold of a word, which the ignorant people around us use in a wrong sense, and, applying it to a meaning which it never has in their minds, has attempted, by this means, to make out his case. Such expedients, however, are not needed in a good cause, and can never be resorted to without exciting the suspicion of dishonest intent.

In concluding our remarks on the charge of concealment, we would say in general, that our position is, as it has ever been, open to all the world. The Instructions we received were publicly given, and are to be found in the published documents of the Board. To these Instructions we have ever endeavored faithfully to adhere. Our main object has ever been to preach the fundamental truths of the Gospel, and to avoid, as much as possible, calling attention to those minor points which unhappily separate Protestant Christians.

(4.) Mr. Southgate, throughout his pamphlet, claims it as an object of the Episcopal mission to Constantinople, *to represent the Episcopal church of America to the Oriental churches.* In explaining his views of this important branch of his labors here, he virtually concedes all that we have ever reported to you concerning his interference with our operations. The substance of what we have written to you of him is, that he has so represented us to

the Armenian people, as to injure, if possible, our influence and our work. Let us hear what he himself says on this point. The presiding bishop of the Episcopal church of the United States had said in his Instructions to Mr. Southgate, "You may further state to them [the bishops and ecclesiastical authorities of the Eastern churches,] that many of those called Protestants, have rejected, and are still so opposed to episcopacy and confirmation and the use of liturgies, that an intimate fellowship and connection with them is at present impracticable." We cannot avoid remarking here, in passing, on the exalted place here given to mere external organization and form. If two churches happen to be alike in the three particulars here mentioned, that is, as to "episcopacy, confirmation, and liturgies," it is implied that a most "intimate fellowship and connection" may be established between them, without regard to fundamental points of doctrine and practice. Thus the Protestant Episcopal church of America may form an intimate fellowship and connection with the Greek church, because the latter holds equally with the former to "episcopacy, confirmation, and the use of liturgies,"—notwithstanding the Greek church is full of the grossest error and idolatry. And this same Greek church must be warned against any intimate "fellowship and connection" with missionaries of purely evangelical sentiments, and who might perhaps be the means of reclaiming them from their errors, and making them acquainted with all that is essential to salvation in the Gospel, merely because those missionaries have not the external forms of episcopacy, confirmation, and a prayer-book! Is this the *divine* way, or is it merely *human invention?*

In regard to these Instructions of the bishop, we have to say, that when they were first printed in the official publication of the Episcopal Board, we stated formally to Messrs. Robertson and Southgate our dissatisfaction with the passage above quoted. They replied, in substance, that we must not understand the bishop to mean all that his words literally imply; that he was an old man and not much acquainted with the business of giving instruction to missionaries, etc. And we are ready most freely to acknowledge that we do not believe the late Bishop Griswold, whose excellencies we well knew, and whose memory we revere, ever could have penned that passage with a full knowledge of its true import. But it matters not, so far as the question between us and Mr. Southgate is concerned, whether he wrote, or even ever saw these Instructions or not. As they are placed over the name of Bishop Griswold, before the public, we must call them his. Mr. Southgate did not attempt to justify the expression referred to, when we first made known to him our dissatisfaction with it; but now, he is ready to endorse every word of it, even when understood in its most obvious and literal sense. He asks

in regard to it, in his "Vindication," (p. 19,) "But is not this a plain matter of fact? And are the American Board and its supporters * * * ashamed or afraid to have it known of themselves? I am not allowed by this passage to oppose, or speak evil of them, but merely to state a plain fact, bearing upon christian communion and fellowship." We reply that it is a plain matter of fact, which we are neither "ashamed or afraid to have known," that we are not Episcopalians, and do not use liturgies; but does Mr. Southgate really expect us quietly to assent to the right of his bishops to instruct him, and to his right to obey their instructions, to come out here and state to the people among whom we have already a successful mission established, that in consequence of our non-episcopal character, "an intimate fellowship and connection with us is impracticable?" And suppose his bishops were to send forth scores of other missionaries, in different directions,—some to Syria, some to the Sandwich Islands, some to Ceylon, some to Bombay, some to Siam; and, in short, some to each people on the face of the earth, among whom the American Board has a mission already established,—and to instruct their missionaries, in like manner, to say to the people every where, that those whom they have hitherto received as their spiritual teachers, have no bishops or liturgies, and not being ordained, are not authorized teachers of the christian religion, and that, therefore, "an intimate fellowship and connection with them is impracticable;" should we be bound quietly to submit to all this, and not open our mouths at all? Now it would be only a *very slight* extension of the principles of the bishop's Instructions, on which Mr. Southgate acknowledges that he has been acting in the East, to put in motion all this machinery for the suppression of non-episcopal missions throughout the world.

In order to understand this subject more clearly, let us suppose a case in which Mr. Southgate, in obedience to his Instructions, states his "*plain fact, bearing upon christian communion and fellowship*," (p. 19.) Let us suppose that, on his arrival here, the second time, from America, he called on the Armenian patriarch, and when a favorable opportunity offered, he said in regard to us; "Those men use no liturgies and have no bishops, and consequently an intimate fellowship and connection between you and them is impracticable." And suppose he had gone ftom the patriarch's room to that of his vicar, and repeated substantially the same thing. And suppose that, subsequently, as good opportunities offered, he were to repeat the same to other bishops and vartabeds residing at the capital. And suppose that he were to state the same "fact," from time to time, to intelligent and influential laymen, and even to some who were decidedly friendly to us. Would all this, or would it not, be an interference with our

labors? And furthermore, it is evident that the Instructions given by boards and bishops to their missionaries, have some object; they imply *something to be done*, some *end* to be attained. And Mr. Southgate, in thus throwing out a word here and another there, in regard to the "impracticability" of "any intimate fellowship and connection" between Armenians and "congregational missionaries," would not expect his words to be 'like water spilled upon the ground.' And suppose he should hear, that in consequence of his representations of us, one man who had so far brought himself into "fellowship" with us as to place a boy in our seminary, had removed him; and not only so, but was exerting his influence upon other parents to persuade them to remove their children also. And suppose that another, who for years had attended the preaching of the gospel in one of our houses, alarmed by Mr. Southgate's representations in regard to our having no bishops to ordain us, were not only to absent himself, but also make the most vigorous efforts to break up the meeting entirely, and even to banish us all from the country. Is this any thing more than Mr. S. would expect as the natural result of his labors in spreading "the plain fact he speaks of, bearing upon christian communion and fellowship?" And is it not plain that Mr. S., in acknowledging that he conscientiously acts according to the Instructions he has received, does in fact confess that he has done or may do all that is above supposed? And this, notwithstanding he elsewhere in his pamphlet declares that he has repeatedly told the Armenians that "his *business* here is not to oppose us," (p. 23,) and notwithstanding his strange assertion that "his *rule* has been *non-interference*." (Ibid.) That he *can* obey the bishop's Instructions, which he confesses that he does, and, at the same time, not interfere with our labors, we regard as an utter impossibility.* Now, what we have reported to you in former communications, in regard to Mr. Southgate, is not that he has opposed us *personally*, but that his church principles have led him, in various instances,† to interfere with our labors, and this we believe he has now, virtually though unintentionally, acknowledged in his "Vindication." We have one remark more to make under this head, which is, that if we were to go to any place

---

* Mr. S. asserts, in his "Vindication," that *during the two weeks of his residence with the Syrian patriarch*, he does not think that he made any use of these Instructions to our prejudice. Pray why should he make this assertion *merely* in reference to his *two weeks* residence with the *Syrian* patriarch, among whose people there were no missionaries of the Board, and say not a word in regard to the manner in which he has used these Instructions during the *years* of his residence near the seat of the Armenian and Greek patriarchs, among whose flocks we have during all this time been carrying on missionary operations?

† See Note II.

where they had a flourishing mission, and make it a special object to set forth the excellencies of *our church* before the people, explaining to them how much more simple and scriptural are its forms than the episcopal; and especially were we to add, that, as the episcopal missionaries are opposed to our simple forms, therefore it is not advisable to come into any close terms of intimacy with them; would Mr. Southgate think that we were doing the thing that was perfectly proper, and of which no living being would have the right to complain?

(5.) Mr. Southgate *boasts* (though if we are to believe him, it is without any boasting disposition,) "that the *two* or *three* episcopal missions in this country have done more, within the *last two years*, to counteract the designs of the papists, and to recover those who were ensnared by their delusions, than the *eight* or *ten* congregational missions have accomplished during the *twenty years* of their existence." (p. 15.) We fear that, notwithstanding Mr. Southgate's declaration to the contrary, many of his readers will believe that this sentence was dictated by nothing else than a spirit of boasting; and especially those who have been in the habit of reading his published communications; for they will there have seen very many exhibitions of the same spirit. He has before spoken repeatedly of congregational missionaries, although he ought to be aware that it is a misrepresentation of facts to call the missionaries of the Board indiscriminately by that name. He now speaks of "the eight or ten congregational missions" in this country, when he ought to have known that there is not even *one* congregational mission here. We will let this pass, however, and proceed to a consideration of his boasted fact, that *two* or *three* episcopal missions have done, in *two years*, towards counteracting papacy, what *eight* or *ten* missions of the American Board (for so we understand his meaning) could not effect in *twenty* years! And he accounts for this supposed fact on the theory that *we* can only act on individuals, and can never expect to move whole communities; but that episcopal missionaries, while they have "far greater advantages for acting upon individuals, have also the power of acting upon masses." (p. 16.) It is true this last assertion is made primarily in reference to the Papists, but he immediately after claims "the same advantages and the same power" for his own church. This reference to the superior power of the *papal* church over us, in acting on masses in the East, satisfactorily explains the whole philosophy of his theory in regard to the superiority of his own church in this respect. The Papists have ever adopted it as a principle, in laboring for the conversion of the Oriental churches, that, if the patriarchs and bishops can be converted, the people are of course secured. Hence they have ever directed their strongest efforts to the clergy.

Every artifice, however unchristian and wicked, has been resorted to, and every motive however low and worldly has been presented to urge them to swear allegiance to Rome. In their view the people are like so many dumb sheep that know nothing, and to entice them into their fold, nothing more is necessary than to secure their shepherds—the bishops and priests. Repeated instances, however, can be referred to, to show that, notwithstanding the extreme degradation of the common people generally in this country, still they are men and not brutes; and they do not always confidingly follow wherever their spiritual guides may choose to lead them. Bishops and patriarchs even have been brought over to Rome, while the mass of the people have resolutely refused to go. The Catholicos himself of the whole Armenian church once took the oath of allegiance to the Roman pontiff, but to this day the great mass of Armenians adhere to their own mother church. Mr. Southgate has evidently caught the spirit of the papal propagandists, so far as this theory is concerned. *He* also represents an episcopal church, and can therefore operate upon *bishops* and *patriarchs*, as we poor Presbyterians and Congregationalists cannot do. And if he can persuade bishops and patriarchs, the *people* will be persuaded as a matter of course. Herein consists his boasted advantage over us, and his power of moving *masses* as well as individuals. For ourselves, we are content to have only that power, in kind and degree, to act upon communities and nations, which the simple preaching of the gospel gives us, when attended by the Divine Spirit;—that power which the apostles and early preachers of Christianity had, who, in spite of the opposition and anathemas of the existing hierarchies, were the instruments, under God, of shaking the whole Roman empire to its very foundations.

And now as to the fact stated by Mr. Southgate, as to what episcopal missions have done in this country against Papists within two years past; we believe that we can clearly show that what he asserts on this subject is a perfectly groundless boast. The principal movement of any episcopal missionaries in these parts, within the time specified, to counteract the designs of the Papists, we believe to have been the effort of Mr. Southgate to restore to the Jacobites a number of their churches in Mesopotamia and Syria, that had been seized and appropriated by the Papists. Firmans for the restoration of these churches had been obtained by the Jacobite patriarch at different times, without any foreign aid, as is distinctly stated in Mr. Southgate's book of travels in Mesopotamia. Within the last two years a new firman has been procured through the intervention of the English ambassador; who, in consequence of the representations of Mr. Southgate and others, was induced to back up the representations of the Jacobite

bishop of Mosul to the Porte ; but, through the counter intrigues of the Papists, this new firman shared the fate of its predecessors. And furthermore, *Mr. Southgate well knew, when he penned the above sentence in regard to what he and his coadjutors have done during the last two years, that that firman had never been carried into effect, and that things actually remain just as they were before his efforts were commenced.*

You will observe that in this case the attempt was merely to recover from the Papists, not masses of people, but masses of stone and mortar,—that is, church buildings ; and even if the firman had taken effect, not a single *soul*, ensnared by Rome, would necessarily have been reclaimed. This therefore could not have been quoted as an illustration of the superior "power and advantages" of Episcopacy for moving communities. And furthermore, the firman was procured by *ambassadorial interference*, and it had nothing to do with Episcopacy, as such. Instead of showing any peculiar power in Episcopacy, or adaptedness to moving masses of people in the East, it only shows the good disposition of Sir Stratford Canning to plead the cause of the oppressed, and, if you please, Mr. Southgate's good disposition, as an individual—not as an Episcopalian—in exerting himself for their relief. As it is, he takes to himself and to his church *all* the praise of this benevolent attempt, the chief part of which is due to Sir Stratford Canning ; and he refers to it as something actually accomplished, in resisting the encroachments of papacy, while in fact the attempt failed and nothing has been accomplished. But, it may be asked, does he not refer to some other instance in which he has been successful in his efforts against papacy ? We answer, that if there had been any such instance, in which papal encroachments had been counteracted in the wholesale manner spoken of by Mr. S., doubtless we should have known it ; for the larger the mass upon which the effort has been successfully made, evidently, the more notorious must be the fact. But we know of no such case in all this eastern world. In connection with this topic, Mr. Southgate declares that he has abundant evidence, that "the papal missionaries regard episcopal missions and not ours, as the great obstacle in the way of their progress." (p. 15.) On this point we have only to say that the Papists have preached against us, written books against us by name, thundered anathemas against us and all who should have anything to do with us, and they have represented us in their published reports as being a very formidable obstacle to their operations in the East. And we have never heard of their ever having even alluded to Mr. Southgate or his colleagues by name, or in any way, so as to distinguish him from us. And we should like, also, to know how it *could* be, that

a knowledge of the fact, that his church is episcopal, would excite peculiar suspicion and peculiar fears in the minds of Papists, while a knowledge of the same fact inspires (as Mr. S. represents) with brotherly love and confidence the minds of the Greeks and Armenians ?

(6.) We wish to call your attention to some *mis-statements* and *contradictions* in this pamphlet of Mr. Southgate, which it would be very gratifying to us to have explained.

On p. 23, Mr. S. says, "I have even declined to form acquaintance with persons whom I knew to be hostile to them," i. e. to us. This declaration has no force unless it means that he has declined both forming and cultivating the acquaintance of those whom he knew to be hostile to us, and *for the reason* that they are hostile to us. There are many persons to be found here, who are hostile to us, but whose acquaintance any decent man would decline forming, because it would be a disgrace to him to be intimate with such characters. We do not assert that Mr. Southgate alludes to such characters merely, but we would like to ask of how much worth is this statement, when, as a matter of fact, he *does* cultivate a most intimate acquaintance with some whom he knows to be among our bitterest enemies. This is the case with at least *three* prominent individuals, who were formerly our friends, but whom he was the principal instrument in drawing away from us, and who have ever since been plotting our overthrow. We are knowing to the fact that they are freely received at his house, and declared by him to be excellent men, in a much better state of mind than they were before ; and the adopted son of one of them, who was a member of our Seminary, Mr. S. has sent to America for an education.

Again, on the first page of the Appendix, Mr. S. takes the word *church* from a newspaper reporter, and uses it in such a way, in reference to our Armenian service, as to leave the impression on the minds of his episcopal readers, that this mode of designating that service is approved and adopted by us, which he certainly knows is not true. Is this fair and candid, or the reverse ?

Again, Mr. S. professes that his rule is non-interference with us, and that he has never in a single instance, departed from this rule (pp. 23 and 25) ; but on page 15 he states it as his deliberate conviction, that Congregationalism cannot possibly produce any strong impression on the *episcopal churches* of the East, not having those features which are considered by these corrupt churches, as the outward and visible signs of a church, and he says in a note on the same page, that where these signs are wanting, these churches will immediately *reject* without further inquiry. But still he acknowledges that he faithfully complies with the Instructions he received, and makes known to these people that we are

wanting in these signs of a true Christian church, knowing that they will immediately *reject* us. What is this but *intended interference* with our labors,—judging the case on his own principles.* Nor is the character of his intentions and motives in the least degree altered, by the falseness of his theories about the comparative advantages of *Protestant* Episcopalians, and *Protestant* Presbyterians or Congregationalists.

Again on page 24, Mr. S. represents us as endeavoring to make the impression that we are Episcopalians, and among other proofs of this he states that until within two or three years "*we were* ALL *supposed to be* BISHOPS." And in a note at the bottom, he says that an Armenian priest said to him but a short time ago, "What a singular church theirs must be, when *all* their ministers are *bishops*." And we also would exclaim—What a singular Episcopacy they must have supposed ours to be, if the impression of which Mr. S. speaks was that *all our ministers are* BISHOPS! According to his representation, the case must stand about thus: We have been laboring hard for thirteen years to make the people of these eastern churches believe that we, like them, and like Mr. Southgate, and like the English church, are Episcopalians, and among other artifices that we have resorted to, such as "wearing the clerical gown," "making the sign of the cross in baptism," and "using the prayer-book," we have told them that in *our* church *all* the ministers are BISHOPS! That is, we have informed them, that among us there is only *one* order of the clergy—whether called *bishops*, or *elders*, or *ministers*, and this led the Armenian priest to exclaim with wonder at the fact that there was such a church in the world. In what manner Mr. S. would reconcile the different parts of this story with itself, we cannot imagine. We have always supposed that *three* orders of the clergy was considered by Mr. Southgate and his church as essential to Episcopacy; and if his object is to represent us as claiming to belong to churches which have only *one* order of the clergy, all of whom are considered as *bishops*, we are willing to answer to this charge before the American public.

Again, Mr. Southgate represents us as studiously avoiding any controversy with him or his church *in the field*, lest our masks should thereby be removed, and the people find out what we are. (p. 12.) He says, "The war will be continued at home; newspaper and annual reports will be full of it; but *here* not a breath will be raised nor a word uttered to show that we are any way distinct from them." We beg you to compare this with a sentence on page 23, in which he says, "Hard speeches said against me, or against my church have been reported to me as coming from

---

* See Note III.

them (i. e. from the missionaries of the Board). I have passed them by in silence for the sake of peace," &c. We would like to ask Mr. Southgate which of these two contradictory representations is true. He first informs his readers that we are so eager for passing ourselves off as Episcopalians that we never utter a word nor even raise a breath *here* to show that we are in any way distinct from him. He then declares, that he has been informed, not merely that we "*raise a breath*" and "*utter a word*," but that we make "*hard speeches* against him and his church." We leave it with Mr. S. to reconcile these contradictions as best he can.

(7.) In conclusion, we shall briefly call your attention to several statements in this pamphlet, our remarks upon which could not well be arranged under any of the preceding topics.

(*a.*) On page 11, Mr. Southgate explicitly acknowledges that "Mr. Badger has assumed a position of hostility" towards the missionaries of the Board. And yet he complains (p. 10), that "no means have been spared to make it appear that this mission, that is, the English mission to the Mountain Nestorians, was a conspiracy against" the operations of the Board; adding that "the missionary, the Society which supported him, and the dignitaries of the church who favored the enterprise, have been assailed with unmeasured abuse." Now, if it is a plain matter of fact that Mr. Badger has placed himself in hostile array against our missions, as Mr. Southgate acknowledges, is it falsifying the truth to represent that his mission is a conspiracy against the operations of the Board? And if "the Society that supports Mr. Badger and the dignitaries of the church who favored the enterprize," after having been well informed of his hostility to us, still continue him in the field, do they not virtually assume the responsibility of all his acts, and are they not really as much to blame as he is himself? And if these facts are stated in the public papers, can it be called "*abuse?*" We do not, however, acknowledge any responsibility in regard to any statements in reference to Mr. Badger or Mr. Southgate, of which we were not the authors; and we will say, in this connection, that in regard to the "Nestorian massacre," we think Mr. Southgate might, in candor, have acknowledged, that the *first* vindication from all blame in the matter, of himself and Mr. Badger, that appeared before the public, was from the pen of Dr. Grant, one of the missionaries of the American Board.

(*b.*) On page 17, Mr. Southgate, in speaking of his first impressions, on visiting the nominally Christian churches in Turkey, remarks—"I was particularly struck with their great resemblance to us, not only in the constitution of their ministry, but in their use of the same creed, and in their general views and prepossessions, with regard to the nature and character of the Christian church. I found myself, in a word, among Episcopalians, and

was at once surprised and pleased with the numerous points of affinity between us." In other portions of this pamphlet, he represents himself as laboring hard and successfully against Papacy; and he rejects the charge (imputed by a reporter to Dr. Anderson) that his influence coincided with the papal missionaries. It must also be borne in mind that when Mr. Southgate returned from America after his first visit there, he brought a letter, signed by seven bishops of his church, addressed to the Greek and Syrian patriarchs, in which the proposition is formally made for a certain kind of friendly alliance and co-operation. Now, we do not intend to charge Mr. Southgate with acting in concert with the Papal church, but from all the above, we cannot possibly conceive why *he* should be unwilling so to act, provided the Papists were willing to accept of such an ally. For, in the first place, there is no *very material* difference between these Eastern churches, among whom he found "so many points of affinity with his own," and the papal church. The latter, equally with the former, has the "three orders." It has also the same "creed," and the same "general views and prepossessions with regard to the nature and character of the Christian church." Why then should not Mr. S. frankly acknowledge, in his communications home, that he finds in the Papal church also "numerous points of affinity with his own?"

And, in the second place, a formal proposition has been made by him, as the organ of his church, to the Greek and Syrian patriarchs, for some kind of an alliance and co-operation. If therefore in the same letter from some missionary of the American Board, in which it was announced that the Greek patriarch has recently issued another thundering bull against the reading of the Scriptures in a language understood by the people, it were also stated that the Rev. Mr. Southgate seeks to form such an alliance with this patriarch as will secure a fraternal correspondence and co-operation between the Greek church and the Episcopal church of America, would the statement be slanderous? And if he can co-operate with the Greeks, on what ground can he refuse to co-operate with the Papists. Every essential error in doctrine and practice, found in the Papal church, is also found in the Greek; and the latter has shown as deep and bitter hostility to evangelical missions as the former. And when the Greek church is as well known in America as the Papal church is, we believe the Episcopalians will seek no more alliance with her.

Mr. S. professes to protest as faithfully against the corruptions of these Eastern communions, as any missionary in the land;" (p. 14); but the question suggests itself at once, what does *he regard as corruptions?* Is it the intercession of the saints? the bowing down to pictures? the worship of the Virgin Mary? or

the use of relics? We have already reported to you, that more than one individual has informed us that he has been instructed by Mr. Southgate, that it is his duty to do all these things, provided he is so commanded by his bishop. And we can refer to his own printed communications to show that he sees very little, if anything, that is wrong in the forms and ceremonies of these Eastern churches—if they were only animated by a new "spiritual life." What, then, can his protestations amount to?

On page 20th, Mr. Southgate gives a most unsatisfactory explanation of the meaning of a certain passage in the letter of "the seven bishops." On this subject we have to state, that, at a formal conference with Mr. S., we once referred to the great unfairness of the bishops, in thus sanctioning the use of the terms Lutheran and Calvinist, as applied to us, here in the East; and we distinctly declared to Mr. S. that we considered him responsible for the injustice that was thus done us, as, if he had not the dictation of that letter, he at least must have known what it contained, and could have had it altered. To all this he, at that time, remained perfectly silent, for he was, no doubt, taken somewhat by surprise. He has since been pressed on this same point in public, and now he attempts an explanation; though to us it appears that it would have been better for him to have remained silent.

On page 21st, Mr. S. asserts that he knows of "*one plan* in particular," which the American Board has "on the mode of conducting their Eastern missions," which it has never published through fear of losing some of its supporters. *We* are ignorant of any such concealed plan, and we would like to have Mr. Southgate called upon to state what it is.

On the same page, and also elsewhere, he speaks of "new interpretations being put upon documents which have been unnoticed for years." He alludes to the Instructions of Mr. Vaughan and Bishop Griswold to him and Dr. Robertson. But has Mr. S. forgotten that what he calls a "new interpretation, is precisely the interpretation we gave of these same documents as soon as they came before the public, and that, *at that very time*, we called upon him and Dr. Robertson to explain them? True, these documents have not been noticed in public, because there was nothing to call for such a notice until it became quite clear, from the course pursued by Mr. Southgate, that the obvious meaning of the Instructions was the true one, and that it was time to lay the whole subject before the public.

On page 23d, Mr. S., in speaking of us, declares that "he has seen *many things* in the doings of the missionaries, which seemed to him of a *most injurious tendency to the great interests of truth and piety.*" We think this declaration implies a charge of a very

grave character, and we hope Mr. Southgate will be called upon to state *definitely* what he has thus loosely thrown out against us. We think we have a right to know what *those things* are to which he alludes, *so "injurious to the great interests of truth and piety."*

But we must not tax your patience any longer. We take the liberty of requesting that if this communication or any portion of it shall be published, it may not appear as a full answer to the "Vindication" of Mr. Southgate, for this it does not profess to be. We have aimed to notice only such things as concerned us at this station; and even here we have often spoken very briefly, or said nothing, believing that you are already in possession of documents sufficient to explain those particular topics. We beg leave to assure you in closing, that we have no apprehension of losing the confidence of our patrons through such efforts as this of Mr. Southgate to injure us. His pamphlet, we doubt not, will be duly appreciated by those whose esteem we most value.

We remain, very truly, yours, &c.

W. Goodell,
H. G. O. Dwight,
W. G. Schauffler,
Henry A. Homes,
C. Hamlin,
G. W. Wood,
H. J. Van Lennep.

APPENDIX.

EXTRACTS OF A LETTER FROM THE MISSIONARIES AT CONSTANTINOPLE, DATED DEC. 1, 1842.

This letter was written soon after the suspension of Mr. Dwight's religious service, and in fact after it had been again resumed; but while the event was yet recent.

Dear Sir,—You have already been informed, in general terms, of some recent circumstances of an unpleasant nature that have taken place among the Armenians of this city. We propose, now, as a station, to give you a detailed account of them, both that you may be fully informed in regard to the whole matter, and also that a record of these events may be preserved for future use in case of need. We would gladly draw a veil of oblivion over transactions so little creditable to those who have been actively engaged in them; but some of the circumstances are too public to be concealed, and a satisfactory explanation of what is already before the world, demands a detailed narration of events, which otherwise we might have chosen to suppress. You have been told that two Armenians, who, for a course of years, have been very friendly to us, have suddenly become our enemies. Formerly, they were seekers for the truth, and we have at times had the hope that one or both of them had become its true disciples. Now, they plead strenuously for the superstitions of their church, and are ready to declare war against every one who even intimates that there are idolatrous practices among the Armenians. Formerly they resorted to us frequently, and made many serious inquiries in regard to the truths of the Bible, with the entire confidence of those, who, conscious of their own ignorance, felt assured that they had found teachers capable of guiding them in the right way. Now they avoid us entirely, as if we were some evil and pestiferous thing, and if they happen to meet one of us, they address us only in pride and in anger. Formerly they commended our books, our seminary, and our labors generally, to their friends and neighbors as they had opportunity. Now, they take special opportunity to blacken our characters in every way; calling us liars, hypocrites, deceivers of the people, heretics and infidels, and warning every body against having to do with us, our school, or our books.

You will wish to know what has produced this change; and on this point we now intend to give you all the light we have, that you may, if possible, be equally qualified with us to judge in the case.

About one and a half months ago we heard that the two Armenians, just spoken of, were suddenly very much enraged against us, and, on inquiring the cause, were told that they had, from some unknown quarter, been put in possession of a translation of a part of one of our journals published in

the Missionary Herald, in which we speak of a division of the Armenian church. (*See Mr. Dwight's journal in the Herald for Sept.*, 1840.) Their understanding of this article was in some respects quite erroneous, and it was evidently just the occasion they had so long wanted to get hold of something, by which they might injure us, if not destroy us. We immediately sought an interview with them, but could not obtain it. We soon learned, however, that *Mr. Southgate* was the man who had put this article into their hands. He had showed it a few days previously to Mr. Panayotes, a Greek, who has long been in our employ, and told him that *if those were our views in regard to dividing the Armenian church, he should feel it his duty to warn the people against us.* This Mr. Southgate denies having said, though Mr. Panayotes, in whose integrity and piety we have the fullest confidence, still affirms that he did say it. We immediately requested an interview with Mr. Southgate, and proposed to him a number of questions in regard to this affair. He acknowledged having translated verbally a part of the article in question to G——, [one of the Armenians already described.] His account of the matter was, that, a few days previously, he had accidentally fallen upon that number of the Missionary Herald, and read the article in question for the first time, and that it had attracted his attention and greatly excited his surprise, as he had supposed our views in regard to a division of the oriental churches were very different from those expressed in that paper. G. happened to come in soon after, and while the thing was fresh in his mind, without any previous thought, or any evil intention against us, he translated it to that individual merely for the purpose of ascertaining whether *he* had understood our views to be such as then expressed; at the same time charging him not to mention the thing to any body else except to Mr. Hohannes, G. himself having requested permission to do so. Afterwards A——, [the other of the two,] came with G. and wished to see the article, and showed that he had received some wrong views in regard to the article, which Mr. S. says he endeavored to correct. He also declares that he then endeavored to persuade them not to let the matter go any farther. Mr. S. declined entirely answering the question, whether he knew of any other person who has exerted an influence to spread this thing among the Armenians. In regard to this question, however, we would state the following facts, which may throw light upon it. A. [one of these two Armenians] declared to Mr. Hohannes, again and again, that he *first* heard of the printed journal through an Armenian, whose name he would not mention, but says it was not from G. There is an Armenian young man, who has been in the habit of attending our Armenian service and who knows English, whose father, we have learned, is calling us by many hard names, and it is evident that his mind has been filled with prejudices by some foreigner. Mr. Southgate himself acknowledged that G. and A. have the above named number of the Missionary Herald in their hands, but he denies having given it to them. Mr. Badger was living at Mr. Southgate's house at the time, and we know that *he* had seen that number of the Herald, and we know also from one witness, and that one an Episcopalian, that he had threatened to inflict a blow upon us, which should cause us to repent of having come out here, and that he declared to Mr. Southgate, that "the American bishops ought to unite with those of England in making such representations to the ecclesiastical authorities of this country, as would lead them to drive us all out." We know, also, that the Jacobite bishop of Mosul, who has been staying a good deal at Mr. Southgate's house, was about that time in the bazaars with *a certain Frank* (name not known,) and as they were buying something from an Armenian young man, a perfect stranger, the Frank asked the young man to what nation he belonged. When told that he was an Armenian, the Frank said, "There are some Americans who have come here and opened a meeting for the Armenians, and are going to divide the Armenian church; why dont you rise up and drive them out of the country?"

The young man was astonished at being addressed in this abrupt manner, on such a subject, in the bazaars, and by a stranger; and he told it to one of our friends, who told it to us. You have the same means of forming a probable conjecture as to who that Frank might be as we, since we have told you that the Jacobite bishop was with him, and that both the bishop and Mr. Badger were at that very time residing with Mr. Southgate. In regard to Mr. Southgate's alleged reasons for what he did, we can only say that they were entirely unsatisfactory. He declares that he accidentally fell upon the article, for the first time, a few days before our interview with him; whereas, in a consultation, called for by Dr. Robertson and Mr. Southgate a year ago or more, Dr. R. brought forward that very article as an evidence that we are not so conservative in our principles as we had professed, and it was talked about and explained by us apparently to their satisfaction. Mr. Vaughan also referred to the same article in his letter to Professor Pond, and it is most likely had written also to his missionaries here in regard to it. At any rate, we know positively that they had read it a year ago, and now Mr. Southgate professes never to have seen it until quite lately, and that by accident! Again, his reason for showing it to the Armenians was altogether unsatisfactory, and contradictory to what he himself said to Mr. Panayotes. If he wished to understand our views, why should he go to an Armenian to ask an explanation of what *he* understood them to be? We can conceive of no other object that he could have had in view, but of exciting prejudices against us in that man's mind; unless we suppose it was altogether a hasty, unpremeditated act, of which he repented the next moment. But, in the first place, Mr. Southgate is not a hasty man. He acts, usually, with thought and deliberation, and he understands well the genius of the people with whom we have to deal in these countries. In the second place, he has the example of Athens fresh before him, and was, of course, most intimately acquainted with all the disastrous consequences of a publication of one of Mrs. Hill's letters in a Greek newspaper. And in the third place, we have to this day not seen, in what Mr. S. has said or done, the slightest evidence that he regrets the part he took in this transaction or the results of it. He even commends the present spirit of the two Armenians above mentioned, saying that they appear to him to be now in about the right position of mind; while they are daily and continually manifesting the most outrageous spirit, full of pride, enmity and bitterness, and are pleading for all the idolatry of their church. Nor can Mr. S. be ignorant of this; for we know it to be a fact, that, at this very time, they are having frequent intercourse with him. It is true that Mr. Southgate, at one consultation, promised, after some hesitation, that he would see those two Armenians, and tell them that he is satisfied that we have no intention of dividing the Armenian church; but if we may judge of the manner in which he fulfilled the promise, from the impression left on the minds of the disaffected by what he said, we cannot suppose that he is ready to take much pains to heal the breach which he has made. One of the individuals referred to, on being asked by one of us whether Mr. S. had communicated anything to them on this subject, replied,—"Yes, he said that he now does not believe that your plan is to divide the Armenian church, *and that you acknowledged that you were sorry you wrote that journal, which was done in the midst of* EXCITEMENT *and* PASSION *occasioned by the persecution!*" We of course have no means of knowing exactly what Mr. S. did say to them except from what they say, from which it is very evident that between them and Mr. S. there is a misrepresentation. In the article in the Herald, of which he translated a part to these Armenians, there is a distinct declaration, twice repeated, *that we are to have nothing to do with dividing the Armenian church.* THIS HE NEVER TRANSLATED TO THEM! but said that we wrote to our Society saying that the present is not a favorable time for a division, but that when the number of enlightened Armenians shall increase, the separation may be effected,

by presenting a petition through some ambassador to the Porte, to have the Evangelical party set off, and a new patriarch appointed over them. If you will take the pains to refer to the journal in question, as printed in the Herald, you will see how distorted a view this translation is of the meaning of the original.

The disaffected Armenians have evidently been told by somebody, a number of things in regard to us calculated greatly to prejudice their minds; such as that *we are not ordained;* that *we are Lutherans* and *Calvinists;* that *we are erroneous in our theological opinions;* that *we are divided into many sects;* &c. We took occasion to ask Mr. Southgate, at the interview we had with him, whether *he* had been the means of communicating these things to their minds? His uniform reply to our questions on these topics was, that *he did not remember* ever having said exactly so. He presumed that if the question had ever been asked him by a native whether he regarded us as regularly ordained, he had probably said "no." He did not know that he had ever said that we were Calvinists and Lutherans, though he remembered once that an Armenian advanced a certain opinion in regard to the Lord's Supper, when he replied to him, "That was Calvin's view of the subject." In regard to this we would say that with Mr. S.'s views on the subject, it can hardly be otherwise than that he should take favorable opportunities to state to the people such things as the above with regard to us. The very fact that *he does not remember*, shows that his principles would allow him to speak to our prejudice in this way among the people here, otherwise he would have remembered, positively, that he never did such a thing. His colleague Dr. Robertson, on one occasion, to our knowledge, when conversing with some Armenians in regard to us, and they ventured to assert that we are regularly ordained, became much excited, and raising both hands said with a loud voice—"*They are no priests; they are no priests; I am a priest, but they are no priests!*" He meant, of course, that we are not ordained; for we never pretended to be *priests*, and he knows well, that, according to our views, there are no priests on earth, under the Christian dispensation.

Mr. Southgate professed, at our interview, as he had in fact before done, to feel a deep interest in our labors here. He remarked that he had "no doubt that the work going on here among the Armenians is the work of God." He even admitted with us that, in case the members of the Eastern churches were not permitted to worship God according to their own consciences, and were persecuted for their love of the truth, and must either sacrifice the truth, or separate, it would become their duty to separate. "Otherwise," said he, "I must condemn the Reformation in Europe." This is precisely the ground that we have taken; and it is the only thing intended in the printed journal referred to, which was written in the midst of persecution for the truth's sake.

As to the effects of this movement thus far, we cannot see that they have been very disastrous. Every effort has been made by the two disaffected individuals to sour the minds of the enlightened Armenians against us; but hitherto, so far as we know, without the slightest success. We record this remarkable fact with a sense of devout gratitude to God, who has thus preserved his people from being torn by the devouring wolves. Some, who were before our enemies, have taken new courage, and probably some (perhaps many) of the ignorant and bigoted class have become more prejudiced against us, but so far as we can ascertain *not one* of our brethren, or of those who were in the habit of attending our services, has been at all unfavorably affected in regard to us. On the contrary they seem to understand the whole matter with wonderful clearness, and, without any explanation from us, place it upon the right ground; and they have received such a lesson on the nature of high church principles as they will probably never forget. Our public service was for a time suspended, with the hope that the two individuals might be conciliated; but we have now become satis-

fied that it is useless to make the least attempt to bring them to terms. In the meantime, the Armenians were never more free in visiting us, and never more importunate that we should have a public preaching service, which has now, at their earnest solicitation, been resumed. Our books, also, were never in greater demand. In short there are no signs of fear among our friends generally, and many of them manifest a readiness to suffer, if need be, for the name of Christ. What they would do if brought to a test, we cannot say, but of some of them we have the hope that, by the grace of God, they would endure to the end, even though visited by persecutions and death.

EXTRACTS OF A LETTER FROM THE MISSIONARIES AT CONSTANTINOPLE, DATED FEB. 7, 1844.

After Mr. Southgate had seen the reports of Dr. Anderson's remarks in reply to the interrogatories put to him at Rochester, and also his reply to the Secretary of the Episcopal Board, he addressed a letter to the missionaries at Constantinople, which led to a correspondence. A copy of this correspondence was transmitted to the Secretaries of the American Board, with the letter from which the following extracts are made.

Dear Sir,—You will receive, with this, a copy of a correspondence between Mr. Southgate and your missionaries at this station, to which I have been appointed to append some explanations. You will perceive that Mr. S. in his first letter, states three charges, which, he says, were made against him by yourself at the last meeting of the American Board in Rochester, and he calls upon us to say, "Whether these charges have been or are preferred by our mission, or members of our mission in this city; and if so, upon what grounds they are based." You will also see from our reply, that we declined answering his questions; on the ground, that if we did so, or entered into any explanations of the subject, that would imply, that we might be held responsible for charges made against him by another, in which no reference was made to us as the authors of those charges; a principle, which we could by no means allow. And furthermore, we learned from Mr. S. himself, that the Secretary of the Foreign Missionary Committee of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States had written to you, asking on what authority you had preferred those charges; and, for aught that we knew to the contrary, you had made known to him the grounds on which the charges had been made. At any rate, while you were the proper person to be called upon to explain your own remarks, it was evidently highly improper to demand from us an explanation. Rather than yield the principle that we are not to be held responsible for the statements of others, nor to be called upon for an explanation of any such statements, we preferred to subject ourselves to the charge of a want of openness and frankness, which Mr. S. preferred against us in his second letter. Whatever we have written to you, *as a station*, in reference to Mr. S.'s doings here, we still believe to be strictly true. We have no evidence that a single fact was mis-stated, and we would retract nothing of all that we have said, so far as the facts in the case are concerned. And we stand ready to take the responsibility before the public, whenever the proper time shall come, of all the statements we have made.

Before proceeding to notice particular passages in Mr. S.'s letters, you will permit us to direct your attention to the principles of action he avows in reference to other missionaries. It seems to us, that we have here, from his own mouth, a virtual confession that all *we* have charged against him is

true, and that this will enable us to explain some things, which otherwise might appear to be inexplicable. In his second letter, he says, "As to my *general* views and course, (which were made—farther perhaps than propriety warranted—the subject of a desultory conversation at the conference,) it would never enter my mind to seek for *them* the approbation of any others on earth, than the committee or the church to which I am responsible."

Again, in the same letter, he says, "Permit me to add, that the only motive of my former communication to Mr. Goodell was, to take a step towards bringing out clearly my position, which is, to represent my own church, and do the work committed to me, without assuming hostility towards, or speaking evil of, the missionaries of other denominations. I have taken this position solely from the conviction, (to which I have been led by earnest prayer and reflection,) that it can only be, under common circumstances, a detriment to the cause of our blessed Savior, to present to the Eastern Christians a spectacle of strife and contention."

"Having assumed this position, I shall not abandon it for any less cause than that which induced me to take it. When the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom appear to me to be receiving injury from any acts of yours, or of others, I trust that I shall not hesitate to use my utmost influence to avert the evil; and in such case, I would know no difference, unless it might be in the particular mode of proceeding, between a missionary of my own church and another."

If these passages have any meaning, it is this, that Mr. S. has deliberately and prayerfully made up his mind not to "assume hostility towards or speak evil of us," unless in his view, the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom require it; and that, if at any time, the course of measures we adopt, in endeavoring to reform these corrupt churches, should, in his view, threaten injury to the Redeemer's kingdom, he should feel called upon to use his utmost influence to avert the evil. And we have an illustration of his principle, as we suppose, in what he actually did when he translated a portion of the Herald to some of the Armenians. We had a preaching service every Sabbath, among the Armenians. This he regarded as one step towards producing schism, which, in his estimation, is one of the greatest of all evils that could threaten these Eastern churches. That he did so regard our meeting, he himself declared to us. What, therefore, could be more natural, or more consistent with his own avowed principles, than for him to "use his utmost influence to avert this evil," i. e. to break up our meeting. This we suppose was one object he had in view, and perhaps the principal one, when he translated from the Herald to some Armenians a passage which seemed to him clearly to show that our design is to divide the Armenian church. We have some collateral testimony on this point to which we must briefly refer you. The two Armenians to whom he showed the Herald, and who, from that time, assumed an attitude of decided hostility to us, were immediately clamorous for the relinquishment of this meeting. One of them had before advised that the meeting be suspended, ostensibly in order to conciliate some worldly men whom he hoped, by this means, to gain over to the truth. But now, for the first time, we heard from them, that if this meeting was continued, *there would inevitably be a division in the Armenian church*, and we were referred, by them, to examples in past ages, where similar meetings have resulted in division; that is, during the Reformation in Europe. Until that moment, we had supposed these men to be entirely ignorant of Church History, and, especially, of the History of the Reformation; but now they seemed to have been taking lessons from some one, who was capable of teaching them, and their acquaintance with the subject of the *schisms* that have taken place in the church, was surprising to us. Who their teacher was, we are not able positively to say, though he was certainly very industrious, just at that particular time. Perhaps we may obtain some light on this subject from a paragraph of an article over the signature H. in the New York Observer for December 2,

1843. The writer is evidently in possession of original documents from Mr. Southgate, and it is possible he may be the Secretary of the Episcopal Foreign Missionary Committee himself, as there is an official air in his mode of writing. He assures the public, "that a suspension of the meetings of the missionaries of the American Board had been under discussion among the Armenians for *four months* before" Mr. S. translated the passage from the Herald. It seems then not only that there had been discussion on this subject, but that Mr. Southgate was knowing to it, and not only so, but that he was so intimately acquainted with the matter, as to be able to state the precise time when the discussion about discontinuing the meetings commenced, namely, just *four months* before he translated the paragraphs from the Herald! Perhaps he *might* also state, if he were disposed, exactly how the discussion originated, and what means were used to give it the right shape and direction so as to produce the desired result, of breaking up these meetings. At any rate, though we cannot prove that Mr. S. himself did originate the thought among the Armenians that those meetings would produce schism, we know that he had the thought in his own mind; for, as we have said, he once avowed it to us; and we gather from the paragraph referred to that he was at least privy to those discussions; and if he did lend a helping hand in any way to bring them to the point which the enemies of the light and truth have always so much desired, namely, to secure the suspension of our meetings, he only acted in accordance with his own avowed principles of action.* It should be stated in this connection, that Mr. S.'s avowed field of labors has always been among the Greeks and the Jacobites, and that he has ever disclaimed any purpose of laboring among the Armenians. How then does he know so well what the private views of the Armenians are, and what topics of discussion come up privately among them.

We have a few remarks to make on the *principles of action* towards other missionaries, avowed by Mr. S., and quoted above from his own letter. He says, that "when the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom appear to him to be receiving injury from any acts of ours, he should not hesitate to use his utmost influence to avert the evil." Here is a principle which, in the abstract, is correct, and upon which we ever desire to act in regard to others. But the question is, how does Mr. S. intend to apply it in actual practice? And here facts compel us to say, we have reason to believe that with him "the Redeemer's kingdom" means the *Episcopal church*, and that any evil appearing to threaten *Episcopacy*, would rouse him to make the necessary counteracting efforts. We do not impeach his honesty in this, nor do we suppose that he considered us as having no part in the Redeemer's kingdom because we are out of the pale of the episcopal church; but his *church principles* require him to regard *Episcopacy* as essential to the full development and extension and glory of Christianity, and therefore any attempt to ward off evils from Episcopacy is to endeavor to preserve the Redeemer's kingdom from detriment. He, therefore, would have no difficulty in opposing us, although he might allow that we are good men, and doing good, provided he believed that our labors tend to bring the episcopal form of government into danger. In such a case, it would matter not to him, that we receive and preach the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ unmixed with any important error, so long as he felt that our measures were subversive of the episcopal form and order. Thus, his motives may be as pure as were those of Saul of Tarsus, who verily thought that he was doing God service by persecuting the Church of Christ; but like him, his zeal may be entirely misapplied, and exceedingly injurious in its results.

Acting on this principle, he used the Herald as he did. Acting on the same principle, no doubt, he, some months subsequently, represented to another pious native, as the individual himself told us, that some of our

---

* *We know* that at that very time the disaffected individuals were frequently at Mr. Southgate's house.

books are very pernicious; pointing out one in particular, in which the doctrine of justification by faith alone, without the deeds of the law, is very plainly inculcated.* Acting on the same principle, probably, he showed to the Syrian bishop of Mosul, who has been for some years in Constantinople, a portion of one of Mr. Hinsdale's published journals or letters, where Mr. H. speaks of the superstitions of the Jacobite church; Mr. Southgate at the same time remarking to the bishop something to this effect; "You see how those missionaries blacken your church." We have this on the authority of Mr. Laurie. From all this, it is evident that the apologist for Mr. Southgate, whose article in the New York Observer has already been alluded to, was mistaken when he said that "the *only* act of seeming hostility on the part of Mr. S. was the reading to a pious Armenian, *a friend* of the missionaries of the American Board, &c. an article from the Missionary Herald." While that act and the consequences of it were still fresh in his mind, he endeavored to prejudice the mind of another "*friend* of the missionaries," as we have stated above, by representing to him that some of our books are of a pernicious tendency. Fortunately that friend was enlightened and stable enough to resist such attacks; but if his mind had become soured, like the others, and he, like them, had turned against us, and joined Mr. S. in his views of the pernicious tendency of our books and our meetings, no doubt Mr. S., if called upon by us to explain his conduct, would have said, that he had no intention of injuring us, and was actuated by perfectly pure motives in what he had done. And he *might* have added, (though we confess that we do not see with what face he could have said it the second time,) that he supposed the individual, to whom he had thus spoken in regard to our books, was a *friend* of ours, and would make no bad use of what he said. If we allow that in the first instance he, through want of proper reflection of what might be the consequences, communicated that article in the Herald to those whom he thought to be stable friends of ours, we should have expected to see in him some marks of sorrow at the results, and some disposition to repair the injury that had followed. What then shall we say when, instead of this, we find that those very men whom he has thus disaffected, and who are using their utmost influence against us, are on terms of the greatest intimacy with him; that he speaks approvingly of their course; and that he actually becomes so far connected with them, as to send the adopted son of one of them, who was a member of our seminary at the time, to America to be educated by the Episcopalians. And what must we think when, a few months afterwards, we learn, that with the consequences of his former indiscretion in speaking thus to our *friends* fresh in mind, he makes another attempt, in another quarter, to work upon the mind of another *friend*, by representing our books to be heretical and dangerous! In our sober judgments we must say, that we think it will be difficult for him to satisfy any candid mind that he is not deliberately and designedly working against us. The individual upon whom the last attempt was made, it is true, is a Greek; and lest a resort should be had to this fact in order to shield Mr. S. from the charge of hostility to *us*,—the Greeks being considered as more properly belonging to his sphere,—we will say, that this brother has been employed by us, in different departments of labor, but chiefly as a translator, ever since the Constantinople station was first established. Being a pious man, he is naturally drawn more to the Armenians than to his own people; and in fact he is much among them, laboring for their good, and his influence over them is exceedingly important. From his long and well-known connection with us, and from his personal character, there is not an

* This tract was written by the Rev. Mr. Johnston, and it is considered by us as one of our best tracts, and contains a most lucid view of the great doctrine of the Reformation—*salvation by faith without the deeds of the law.* We may add that it has been examined and approved by the Committee of the American Tract Society, of which Dr. Milnor is a member. Mr. Southgate remarked to our Greek friend, "The doctrine of that tract is not the doctrine of your church, nor mine." The Greek replied, "The standards both of your church and mine inculcate that doctrine."

individual among all our Armenian acquaintances, who could exert so extensive an influence against us in the *Armenian* community as he could, if he should by any means get his mind prejudiced. Mr. S. is perfectly well acquainted with his standing and influence. And besides, though he had been a common Greek, having no connection with us, and Mr. S. had made such remarks to him against our books, though the consequences of his laboring against us would have been less to be dreaded, yet the evidence of Mr. S.'s hostility to our labors would not have been less convincing. For no candid man can perceive the least real difference between an effort on the part of Mr. S. directly to prejudice the Armenians, and an attempt to do so through the agency of a Greek.

Mr. S., as you will perceive, makes it a point of great importance to establish it as a fact, and to draw from us a concession of the fact, that his *motives* in that particular act of translating the Herald to the Armenians, were good, and that he had no *personal* feelings of hostility to us. And he makes much of the fact that some of us did, in so many words, acknowledge our satisfaction on this point, at our conference. In regard to this we would say, that we do not see what real advantage it is to him for us to allow that *personally* he is not our enemy, or that we believe that *he thinks* he is doing God service in opposing our labors. It may often happen, that political and theological antagonists are personal friends. The simple question between us is, whether he has actually and from design (whatever may be the motive,) opposed our labors; and of this, we think there are conclusive proofs. And if, at the conference alluded to by him, any of us were satisfied by his plausible statements, that he performed the act in question rather inadvertently, and not with a positively hostile intent; we must say, that the manner in which he fulfilled his promise of endeavoring to repair the injury he had made, and his whole subsequent course, have effectually removed every such impression from our minds. As a matter of fact, however, we were never satisfied with the explanations he then made, and of this we abundantly assured him at the time. It remains to be seen what inference the enlightened public of America will draw from the facts in the case, and we are willing for the present to refer the matter to their verdict. We might indeed adduce other evidences of his opposition to us, not as individuals, but as non-episcopal missionaries. One of these, which has no inconsiderable degree of weight, is the *general impression of the Armenians here*. All who know anything about the parties, have a clear and strong impression, that he is inimical to us; and this they have got entirely from their own observation of the case, for we have, up to the present moment, scrupulously refrained from bringing any charges against him before the people or before individuals. It is not long since another case of temporary alienation from us occurred, in an individual who was for a long time our friend. He was persuaded, by the false representations of those very men to whom Mr. S. showed the Herald, that we are *wolves in sheep's clothing*, laboring here under a show of much spirituality and sanctity, but really aiming at the subversion of all religion. He joined that party, and for a while made a most vigorous effort to corrupt the minds of our brethren among the Armenians;—reiterating the oft-repeated stories that we have no regular ordination; that we are Lutherans and Calvinists; that in America we are divided into numberless sects; &c., &c.* He did not long continue, however, in this wayward course, before he became convinced of his error, and he speedily returned with an humble confession of his fault, and has ever since remained our friend. In a conversation with one of us, since his return, he, of his own accord, alluded to Mr. S., and expressed the greatest wonder that we were on speaking terms with him; "for," said he, "he is one of your greatest enemies." We inquired what

---

* We heard these stories for the *first* time, immediately after the Herald had been exposed, and from the mouths of those very men to whom Mr. S. translated the Herald. One of them said of us to Mr. Panayotes, "We thought these men were *bishops*, but behold we have learned that they are not even *priests*. *They are not ordained at all.*"

evidence he had of that. He said, "Mr. S. is continually talking against you." This is only a single case.* We have testimony of a similar kind from many quarters; and indeed, it is a common impression among the Armenians, that Mr. S. has been the cause of all those prejudices that have sprung up against us, in the minds of men who were formerly friendly. Whence did this impression arise? It surely never came from us; and we cannot account for it, except on the supposition that there is something in Mr. S.'s mode of speaking to them in regard to us, that leaves such an impression on their minds. Another fact, bearing upon this same point, and which has hitherto been unexplained, is this; that just at that very juncture when the Herald was shown, we *for the first time* heard from some two or three Armenians, and those the very individuals to whom Mr. S. had translated the paragraph, such charges against us as those mentioned above, viz. that we are *Lutherans*, and *Calvinists*, and have *no ordination*, and are *dangerous schismatics*, &c.

And here we must introduce Mr. Badger. He was at that time a guest in Mr. Southgate's house, and had been for months. We do not know, and of course we shall not undertake to say, just how much of this work of vilification was done by Mr. B. and how much by Mr. S. But the question is brought before us by Mr. S.'s correspondence—Did he (Mr. S) cooperate with Mr. Badger? And on this point we think the evidence is sufficient to convince any impartial jury in the world. We do not undertake to prove that Mr. S. sympathized with Mr. B. in all his theological views, or that he was ready to go all lengths with him in opposing heresy. On these points, we are not sufficiently informed to speak with any certainty, nor are they essential to our present inquiry. Mr. B. came out from England under the patronage of the bishop of London to go to Mosul, so far as appears, for the express purpose of counteracting the labors of the American missionaries there. This is declared by the editor of the London Record to have been his avowed object; and if we are called upon for other proof, we would refer to his whole course since his arrival upon the ground, which has been a course of steady and determined hostility to our mission. The evidences in the case are already in the hands of the Committee. What we wish to direct your attention to in this place is, that he came originally from England with this intention. Like Saul of Tarsus he came *breathing threatenings*, if not slaughter, all along the way, against all non-episcopal missionaries. This man Mr. S. received into his house, and kept him for several months, while at the same time he was perfectly well informed in regard to his spirit and intentions.† We have it from a person of undoubted veracity, who was present at the time, that Mr. B. declared that a blow was preparing for the American missionaries, which would cause them to repent of having come out here to these eastern churches.

Now we have apostolical authority for saying that Mr. S., by treating Mr. B. in this friendly manner, actually became a partaker of his evil deeds. For John says, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed, is *partaker of his evil deeds.*" It is useless for Mr. S. to say that he opposed *some* of the views and plans of Mr. B., for if he did so, it was in a private manner, while publicly, before all the world, he acted towards him as a confidential friend. Nor will any reasoning convince the enlightened public that he did not, in the main, coincide with Mr. B., until he comes out with an express and unqualified disavowal of such a coincidence. Furthermore, whatever agency Mr. B. had,

---

* An Armenian, who by some means learned that Mr. Southgate addressed notes to us sometimes, prefixing the title of *Rev.* which he had understood was given to clergymen alone, expressed the greatest astonishment to one of us, as, he said, Mr. S. does not acknowledge that we are ordained.

† Mr. S. himself admits Mr. Badger's hostility to the American missionaries, and that it was a topic of conversation between them.—Ed.

in souring the minds of the disaffected Armenians, was exerted while at Mr. S.'s house, and it will be difficult to convince the public that Mr. S. did not introduce Mr. B. to those Armenians, and interpret for him, as Mr. B. was an entire stranger both to the people and to their language.

The facts now stated, it is conceived, are sufficient to establish the point with which we started, viz. that Mr. S. has been a co-operator with Mr. B. And if Mr. S. should reply that while these facts prove a co-operation, they do not show that he co-operated *against us*, we would answer that we are perfectly willing to leave this question also to be decided by impartial public sentiment. We conceive that it will be difficult for him to satisfy any reasonable man, that having so many points of intimate connection with Mr. B., and having never publicly (if in any way) protested against any of his extravagancies, he regularly parts company with him whenever he begins to say or do any thing against the missionaries of the Board. Taking into view all that we know of Mr. Southgate, we confess that we do not believe it.

We had intimated in our second letter to Mr. S. that he had translated "disjointed extracts" from the article in the Herald, and in his third letter, he positively denies this, saying that he translated the whole. At our conference, he stated distinctly, and we all remember it well, that he translated only *a part* of the article, though what part we did not learn. Afterwards, however, the individual to whom he first showed the journal came, at different times, to two of our houses, and the whole of that part of the article referring to a division of the Armenian church was read to him; and when we translated that portion which says that we, the missionaries, could evidently have nothing to do with dividing the church, he was startled, and asked with earnestness if it was so printed. And when assured that it was precisely so, he said that he had not heard that before. This, in connection with Mr. S.'s own assertion at the conference, led us to charge him with translating "disjointed extracts" from our journal, and we do not yet see reasons to retract the charge, although he now denies it.

We would also say, in reference to the paragraph in his third letter, succeeding the one above alluded to, that we actually did as he says he thinks we were in duty bound to do. That is, we did make known to you, in our history of the conference to which he alludes, that he declared to us that he did not show the Herald from any bad motive; and also that he did promise to make an effort to repair the injury that had arisen from that act. At the same time we stated that we were not satisfied with his manner of performing his promise, nor are we to this day.

Mr. S. cannot conceive upon what you based your public charge against him of being the chief cause of the suspension of our meeting, if our report of the affair contained a fair statement of his declaration of innocent intention, and of his effort to prevent injury. The fact is, that his subsequent conduct did not increase our confidence in the honesty of his desire to counteract the evil he had done. That his act was the chief proximate cause of the suspension of the meeting is perfectly evident, however many remote causes may have had to do indirectly with the matter. And here we must refer again to the episcopal correspondent in the New York Observer, who, owing to an imperfect knowledge of the facts, has made some very erroneous statements on this subject. He says, that "for a *long time* prior to any act on the part of the authorities, or any supposed interference on the part of episcopal missionaries, serious doubts had existed in the minds of the most sober of the Armenians, who had attended the instruction of the missionaries of the American Board, as to their influence upon the integrity of the Armenian church." And again, "That a suspension of the meetings of the missionaries of the American Board had been under discussion among the Armenians for four months before this incident occurred, and that the Armenians have ever declared that the information received concerning the article in the Herald, had no influence whatever in procuring the suspension of the meetings." We have a single remark to

make in respect to these extracts, which is that there is hardly one word of truth from beginning to end, though we have no reason to doubt that the writer of the communication believed he was uttering facts when he penned the article. In the first place there never was any "act on the part of the authorities" suspending our meetings; and in the second place there never could have been a discussion among the Armenians, in regard to the suspension of these meetings, for they had it not in their power to suspend them; unless the writer means to say that the ecclesiastical powers of the Armenian church were debating *how* they might put an end to what is so undesirable in their eyes. But this does not seem to be his meaning. The meetings were suspended *by ourselves solely*, and in consequence of the excitement occasioned by Mr. Southgate's act. It is true we felt impelled by the circumstances to take this step, to avoid what we feared would have been more disastrous. We did it with the hope of allaying the feelings of those whom, up to that moment, we had regarded as brethren. But no authority, civil or ecclesiastical, had any thing whatever to do with the closing of our preaching service. After a few weeks suspension, we, at the earnest and repeated request of our former hearers, re-opened the service, and it has continued from that time to the present. The assertion that the exposure of the article in the Herald "had *no influence whatever* in procuring the suspension of the meetings," is entirely false. As we were voluntary agents in suspending the meetings, and acted in the matter in view of certain existing circumstances, we may be supposed to be at least as well informed as any body else, as to what was the real cause of this step, and our own reasons for taking it; and we here solemnly declare that the act of Mr. S., in showing that Herald to the Armenians, and the misrepresentations made of us at that time and in connection with that act, were the immediate cause of the suspension. The great excitement produced on that occasion, was occasioned by that act. That the two individuals, to whom he showed the Herald, were previously in a state of mind fitted to receive a bias against us, we are quite ready to believe; and if Mr. S. was aware of this, as we conclude he was, from the statement that for a *long time* prior to this event, serious doubts had existed in the minds of some Armenians in regard to the tendency of our instructions, and they had been discussing the subject of suspending the meetings for *four months* previously, then we say he has the greater sin.

NOTE I.

Extracted from a Letter dated Constantinople, May 25, 1844.

[This letter was written with reference to a letter from Mr. Southgate published in the "Churchman" of Dec. 2d. The extracts are appended as Notes to the letter in reply to the "Vindication."]

Mr. Southgate has always been designated by his Committee as a missionary, or delegate to the Greeks and Jacobites, and they have carefully avoided speaking of him as having any thing to do with the Armenians; thus leaving the impression on the public mind, that the episcopal mission in this city was not designed to interfere with the mission of the American Board, whose efforts, it is well known, are among the Armenians. Mr. S. himself has also explicitly declared to us, that he had no intention of entering the Armenian field; although he once gave us notice that some labors would be commenced among this class of people, in an entirely different department from any occupied by us, and which were not designed as any interference with our field. But if there is any meaning in the letter of Mr. S., extracted from above, it is that he is actually laboring in the same field with us; for, otherwise, how could he speak of his superior advantages, as an Episcopalian, in gaining an influence with the people, and of our being unwilling that he should avail himself of these advantages. Surely he

could not mean to say that we have complained of any influence that he has excited against us, either among the Greeks, or the Jacobites, for we have not a single missionary in Constantinople, sent to either of these people. This very letter, therefore, contains a tacit acknowledgement that he is endeavoring to gain an influence among the Armenians.

In the "Spirit of Missions" for March, 1844, there is a journal of Mr. Southgate, in which he speaks of calls received, and visits made, though not only are the names of the individuals alluded to concealed, but also the nation to which they belong. To us it is known that some of them, and we think it probable that most of them, were Armenians. This journal, as he says himself, is only given as a *specimen* of his constant work, and it extends through the period of only one week. It is plain, therefore, that this intercourse between Mr. S. and the Armenians, is not the casual intercourse which is sometimes to be expected, between a missionary and individuals of every class of the people around; but it is a studied and previously arranged intercourse, the carrying out of a plan of labor among the Armenians. We beg that you will understand, that we do not claim the right to exclude the Episcopalians from the Armenian field, though we think that in christian courtesy, and christian wisdom too, they might leave it to us; but we wish to have the fact distinctly known, that they are attempting to cultivate this field, though they carefully conceal it from the public in America.

NOTE II.

Extracted from the same Letter.

Mr. Southgate has been engaged in preparing two works for the press, in the Armenian language; viz. *The Church of England Prayer Book*, and *Nelson on Feasts and Fasts*. The expenses of translating and printing are defrayed by the Christian Knowledge Society of England.

In his preface to the latter book, Mr. S. says, that many people in this part of the world say that all the English are infidels, and that they have no bishops, no feasts, no fasts, no book of prayers, etc., and that this book will show to all such people the falseness of the charge, since, in fact, all these things are found in the English church. But he cautions his readers against the supposition that all Englishmen have the same ground for rebutting the charge of infidelity, for he says, "There are Englishmen who have none of these things, but they do not belong to the English church." Whether they are good men or bad, he does not say, but leaves the people to draw their own inferences. Some have already told us, of their own accord, that they understand the persons referred to there to be infidels,—which is a very natural inference from Mr. S.'s language, though there cannot be a doubt that he referred to those who are not Episcopalians, and he knew when he wrote it, that in the minds of many of his readers, *we* should be regarded as the persons referred to. Now we have not the slightest objection to being known as not belonging to the church of England, though, in bringing the pure gospel to the people, we cannot see the expediency of publishing, first of all, to them the fact that questions of mere external interest and minor points do divide evangelical Christians in England and America. Mr. S. has been careful to do this on various occasions, and here, in the very first book he has brought forth, for enlightening the people, he again directs their attention to this fact, that Protestant Christians are divided in sentiment! And not only so, but from the manner in which the statement is made, many of the readers of the book will suppose him to mean, that all who do not symbolize with the English church are infidels."

Mr. S. says that he cannot "conscientiously conceal the fact of an episcopal church in the West," etc. And we know not any one who would wish him to do so; but is Mr. S. as conscientious in making known the precise *nature* and *grounds* of the difference between us, as he is in publishing the fact itself? He is an Episcopalian and we are not, and in this

respect he certainly can claim some points of sympathy with the Eastern churches which we cannot, and we never could blame him for making use of his "advantages" in this respect. His church has bishops and a liturgy, and so have the Eastern churches, while we have neither. But while Mr. S. has felt so conscientiously bound to make use of his superior advantages in this respect, has he also conscientiously informed the people how nearly we accord with the standards of his own church, in all the great fundamental points of doctrine? Has he told them that, as to the great doctrine of man's ruined state by nature, of the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and of justification by faith alone without the deeds of the law, etc, our views are the same with those expressed in his own articles of faith? On the contrary, has not his conscience been entirely asleep in regard to our rightful claims to be correctly represented by him, (when he speaks of us at all,) as to the general correctness of our faith, and has he not in fact so spoken of us as to leave the impression that, while *he* belongs to the true apostolic church, we are to be classed among such as Arians, heretics, and infidels. We do not assert that Mr. S. has actually intimated to the people that we are to be thus ranked, but that he has actually taken advantage of their ignorance, and of their prejudice, and told only half the story to them, so as to leave this impression on their minds. The book he has just published is an example of what we mean. He has there laid claim to belonging to *the* apostolic church, having bishops, feasts, fasts, prayer-book, etc. And he declares to the people that we have none of these things. This he did *conscientiously*, in order to make full use of his "advantage" in being an Episcopalian. But his conscience led him no farther. He did not add, that those men who have no bishops, fasts, or prayer-book, are still true christian men, who receive the Bible as their only guide, and as to the great doctrines of the Bible, their belief is in the main correct. He chose to leave the people to imagine for themselves what must be our character, and this he did well knowing that their prejudices would inevitable lead them to call us infidels.

NOTE III.

Extracted from the same Letter.

Mr. S. says in the letter quoted, that a knowledge of the fact that we "are opposed to bishops and precomposed forms of prayer," "would be ruinous to us among the eastern Christians." We have already shown that we have practised no concealment of our sentiments on these subjects; but let us now look at the matter, from the point of view assumed by Mr. S. He asserts that we have endeavored carefully to conceal from the people our opinions on these topics, and that we should be "ruined," provided our sentiments were known; but yet he publishes, with his own mouth, that he is doing his best to make known to all the people these very facts, which, according to him, we so carefully conceal, and which will "ruin" us as soon as they are known! Thus he is willing to sacrifice us, and all the good that may be done by the preaching of the gospel, through our means, for the sake of the advantage of placing himself before the people as belonging to a church that has bishops and a liturgy! With his eyes fully open to the fact that the course he is pursuing is going to prove "ruinous" to us, (according to his belief,) he still perseveres, and thus shows his willingness to "ruin" us, merely because we are not Episcopalians, even though, as he has often acknowledged, we preach the gospel and are doing good! Two things appear very obvious from this declaration of Mr. S., first, that in his mind *Episcopacy* and a *liturgy* are far more important than any thing else, even than the precious doctrine of *Christ and him crucified;* and secondly, that he has resolved to take such a course as he fully believes will "ruin" our mission, and thus he virtually acknowledges all that has ever been charged upon him in regard to interfering with our labors, while pursuing, as he calls it, "the even tenor of his way."